DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 715 JC 710 150

AUTHOR	Robbins, William A., Comp.; Martorana, S. V., Comp.
TITLE	Proceedings of the Conference on Student Development in the Community Colleges: Directions and Designs for the Seventies.
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Student Development Center.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	113p.; Proceedings of a conference sponsored by the Two-Year College Student Development Center and the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges, State University of New York, March 9-10, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes, *Collective Bargaining, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Finance, *Junior Colleges, Student Characteristics, *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS	*New York

ABSTRACT

This report of a March 1970 conference on student development in community colleges includes the papers presented and the major points of discussion that followed each presentation. Speakers focused on the present situation, but kept an eye to the future. Among the topics considered were: some student characteristics and their implications for student personnel; community colleges and the disadvantaged student; a president's and trustee's view; financing community college education; and collective bargaining and the college student. (CA)

ED050715

JC 710 150

W

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE
ON
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES
DIRECTIONS AND DESIGNS
FOR THE SEVENTIES

SPONSORED BY:

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges
State University of New York

The Two-Year College Student Development Center
State University of New York at Albany

March 9 and 10, 1970

State University of New York

at Albany

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 29 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CONTENTS

PREFACE - William A. Robbins

INTRODUCTION - S. V. Martorana

I. A LOOK TO THE FUTURE
- A President's View - Seymour Eskow
- Questions and Discussion

II. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT AND THE 1970's
- Some Student Characteristics and Their Implications for Student Personnel - Charles C. Collins
- Questions and Discussion
- The Community College and the Disadvantaged Student - Vera K. Farris
- Questions and Discussion
- The Career View - Seymour L. Wolfbein
- Questions and Discussion

III. COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND THE 1970'S
- Financing Community College Education - Merritt M. Chambers
- Questions and Discussion
- Collective Bargaining and the College Student - William McHugh
- Questions and Discussion
- A Trustee's View - Joseph Klegman
- Questions and Discussion

IV. SUMMARY
- Conference Observations - Joan Purtell

V. APPENDIX
- List of Participants

PREFACE

This conference was organized to examine developments affecting students in the two-year colleges. The beginning of the 1970's seemed a very appropriate time to implement this examination. This new decade represents a wholly new and different period. The turmoil of the society affects both the institution and the student body of the two-year college.

Each year increasing numbers look to the community college to provide answers to some of the problems facing society. Because the community colleges historically were fashioned and given life to treat new problems in American education, these colleges are accustomed to change. Yearly they adapt themselves to newly-arising needs--those of students, jobs, programs and community changes. Community colleges are not ivory-tower institutions, but rather function as an intrinsic part of society. Invariably all students of these institutions--the young, old, full-time and part-time, are affected by social events on a national-global scale as well as on a community scale.

At the conference we strove to identify certain of the developments that seemed to be of paramount importance. But, even at the moment the conference began, the external press demanded response. Dr. Seymour Eskow, a president, was summoned home to face an acute issue of campus unrest. However, a quick rescheduling of the program enabled the participants to hear him before he departed.

The Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges joined enthusiastically in the co-sponsorship of this conference. The conference was planned in the form of a short, intensive seminar, to which leaders, especially concerned with the education of two-year college students, from the New York State Education Department, the State University of New York, and the State University of New York at Albany, as well as faculty and administrative representatives of the community colleges were invited. Katherine Pinneo and Francis P. Hodge helped immeasurably by turning stenographic copy into readable discussion giving shape and form to this conference report.

Difficult educational, social and economic problems were discussed at the conference. Some of these problems are acute while other have long-term significance. Only if comprehensive, open door colleges, come forward with effective answers to these problems, will the community college be in a position to meet successully the needs of its students.

William A. Robbins, Director
Two-Year College Student Development Center

INTRODUCTION

The Two-Year College Student Development Center was established to assist in the improvement of the processes involved in the development of two-year college students. In the very broadest sense the Center serves as a vehicle for short-term workshops, seminars, and conferences devoted to those who have a responsibility or interest in the two-year college student.

The Office of Two-Year Colleges of the State University of New York was pleased to join with the Center in co-sponsoring this conference aimed at bringing together key leaders from a variety of fields related to community college education in order to focus attention on some of the areas that will affect the processes of student development in community colleges during the next few years. Representation of speakers was purposely broad, but not totally comprehensive. The conference attendees were limited to provide the setting for a genuine exchange of ideas.

In this manner we sought to bring forth ideas which may assist those of us associated with the two-year colleges in our search for directions and designs for the '70's. We felt that the conference accomplished this objective and that the presentations and discussions would be of interest to many associated with the community colleges.

S. V. Martorana
Vice Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges
State University of New York

I. A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

* A PRESIDENT'S VIEW OF THE SEVENTIES

Seymour Eskow

President, Rockland Community College

Seymour Eskow has been President of Rockland Community College in Suffern, New York, since 1963. His undergraduate study at the University of California was in Dramatic Literature. He received a masters degree in English at Teachers College, Columbia, and the Ph.D. degree in Higher Education at Syracuse University. Dr. Eskow joined Mohawk Valley Community College when it began in 1946 as a teacher of English, and provided leadership at the college as head of the College's Department of General Studies, Director of the Bureau of Field Services, and Dean of Instruction. For a decade many students and parents across the country have relied on Dr. Eskow's advice and information in the publication, Guide to the Two-Year Colleges.

I have been asked to talk about the college president's view of what might be happening in the seventies, particularly as our institutions might be changing in the area of student development and student personnel services. Edward Schwartz, a very articulate philosopher of student power and recent past president of the National Student Association, well experienced in commenting on and dealing with college presidents, attributed much campus tension to what he called general presidential insecurity. He said, "I doubt if there are many professional groups more self-pitying than college presidents." It occurred to me that he's right. If you meet with a group of college presidents in these days when they're not publicly performing and showing you their physical mask of self-assurance, there is a certain amount of whimpering and self-pitying going on. There is talk about deserting for a staff position in Albany or an executive position in industry or a teaching position anywhere. There is a certain amount of unhappiness with the position as it has evolved.

I think that the reasons are not that college presidents through the sixties were less courageous and less brave than college presidents or corporation executives elsewhere. But that unlike corporation executives who assume that strike experience may be part of their experience, or a military commander who expects to have to deal with violence, we college presidents generically have been unprepared by training, by talent, by temperament for the kinds of forces with which we have been confronted. There is a certain amout of self-pity and whimpering going on.

If this means there is a flight from administration, I think it's terribly sad. It occurs to me that despite the mythology of executive power as it exists in our institutions, we are really now experiencing, at least partially, the fruits of the managerial vacuum that we have in most institutions of higher learning. I think we have had a collection of departments and common parking lots and buildings and no central or cohering force. At the same time, we have had the widespread notion that many of our ills are the result of autocratic and authoritarian administration. What I'm saying is that we need college presidents who represent new kinds of scholar-strategists, people who are prepared other than, and differently than, those of us who lived through the sixties. We have to be taught how to cope with confrontation, with bullhorns, with militants on the faculty, militants in the student body and most of us are not helped by most of the advice that we are given in much of the literature.

---

* Taken from Verbatim report of presentation delivered at the conference.

For example, the theory of communication: most of us are told that failure to create a viable campus community is because we have failed to communicate with the faculty; we have failed to communicate with the students; we have failed to communicate with the community which in itself is composed of conservatives and liberals. We have failed to communicate with the trustees. The obvious conclusion is that if we learn how to communicate, if we learn how to persuade, if we share our powers and participate, then we will have a new and happier community. I doubt that this is a very helpful thing to tell a beseiged campus community and a president in difficulty.

It's more useful, I think, to suggest that what we have done is create a structure of governance that is so complex and so unmanageable that it is literally impossible to communicate with all the constituencies and concerns that now exist. For example, if you create one authority structure that includes the faculty member who is part of a department reporting to a department head and in turn to a dean up the line of command; if you create another network that includes the Faculty Senate and the committees; and if you have still another pattern of decision-making that includes the board of trustees and the state body of governance, you have made the system of decision-making confusing enough and incoherent enough, that it is impossible to work with, regardless of how long and how much you communicate.

I'm attempting to reflect in a kind of presidential way on the kind of presidential malaise that I've been talking about. I want to give you a quote that I enjoy more than the one from Edward Schwartz. This one is from Edmund Burke who attempted to come to terms with the French Revolution. He never really did, as you remember. He said, "He that wrestles with us strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill; our antagonist is our helper." That's lovely because it suggests that those of us in the academic community--trustees, students and faculty, administrators who have been wrestling with critics and confrontationalists and militants--have something to learn from our antagonism, and that during the sixties we have had in the community colleges our institutional commitments tested. We are now ready to determine what of the community college ideology has survived intact and what has to be modified.

Let me tell you what I've learned from the trials of the sixties and what I'm beginning to struggle with as I attempt to learn a new vocabulary as a result of our recent trials. I think, first of all, that the central articles of faith in the community college ideology have survived intact the struggles of the sixties. We talk about the community college movement and the very notion of a movement implies that we have a central faith. We don't talk about the four-year college group or the university center group but the community college is part of an evangelic movement with certain ideological assumptions. These have not only withstood the tribulations of the sixties but are spreading rather rapidly to other sectors of higher education.

I think the three central articles of faith for our purposes are these: the first article is the basic notion of the community college--that it has to be an organic part of the community in which it exists so that the community becomes the central, the essential generator of institutional reform, the generator of program, the generator of instructional services. The individual institution is not just a pallid copy or at least a copy of an institution that might exist 50 or 100 miles away but is actually part of the fabric of its particular community. We call these community colleges. I think that notion has stood up to the test of the sixties very well, and other institutions like Columbia, like Chicago, like California, are beginning to talk the same language.

The second article of the community college faith is that our institutions should be open to all the students in our communities, all students regardless of their academic ability, regardless of previous condition of academic servitude, regardless of age, of color or creed, open to all--the so called "open door philosophy." That article of faith survived intact, I think, and the latest pronouncements from City University and State University make it almost seem to some of us who are old philosophers of the community college movement that we are in the process of turning all of our institutions into community colleges.

The third central article of faith is that as you tailor these institutions to the local communities, as you open the door wide to all students, you have to develop and offer a broad spectrum of instructional strategies, of curricular responses, and of counseling services. Those are the three articles of faith and I think they have survived very well.

What we have come to recognize as a result of the confrontations is that while the faith, while the vision is substantially sound, the accomplishments, the performance is well behind the rhetoric. We have really failed to create many institutions whose forms, whose programs, whose services really grow out of the local community context. We've talked the language of community but essentially we get our inspiration from the catalogs of those institutions that have preceded us. We get our architectural shapes by copying each other. We get our curriculums in each new institution, we get our electrical technology program by copying the electrical technology program elsewhere.

The community has been part of our rhetoric rather than part of our performance. We have talked the open door and we have tried, we have really tried, but we are a long way from enrolling all of the segments of our community that really require our ministrations. The door has been opened or we have said that the door is open, but we haven't been too unhappy about the failure of many segments of our community to walk through that door. And finally, although we have talked about our willingness to create new instructional directions, new curricular packages, new counseling strategies, we have not really done very much more than announce our intentions. I've wondered why with faith as sound as ours, and I believe it is sound, with commitments as clear as ours to community, to accessibility, to the open door, and to innovative practices, why we have done so little, in fact.

I want to suggest some of the conclusions that have occurred to me. Whitehead talks about the need for both the vision and the technique. Without the vision the people perish. I think we do not yet have a body of technique to deal with the aspects of our vision. I will come back to that later.

I think secondly, our institutions have been manned by colleagues from other institutions who have brought into our homes other visions and the sense of subverted failure. Most of us come from four-year institutions that have been selective, that talk about rigor and discipline and standards. We have been ourselves shaped by that institution's ideology. Most of our professors and our administrators join our institutions with those rhetorics, with those logics and that sense of so keeping constant pressure on us, that we are prevented from really exploring and developing roads toward the accomplishment of our mission. I think our vocabularies, our instruments, our strategies, our structures, because they have been borrowed from these other institutions, have continously distorted our work.

Let me give you some examples. The four-year colleges have admissions offices so we in the community colleges have admissions offices. Now, why do we have admissions offices? The high schools don't have admissions offices to screen applicants from the junior high schools. It's just assumed that if you go through the junior high school, you will automatically go into the higher classes. Now, we're talking about the community college as a universal post-secondary experience. We're talking about an open door experience available to all students, but we have admissions offices at State University two-year colleges, and what do they do? They collect exactly the same forms, and use exactly the same assessment instruments as the senior colleges do. The students take the same tests as the senior college people do as if the problem of the two-year college admissions office was identical to that of the senior college office. The senior college has an office because it must decided who will enter and who will be rejected. It has the problem of making "Go, No-go" decisions and they do that by getting these cognitive measures and measures of class standing and saying "You go" and "You don't." Now, what do we do with all those pieces of paper in the community college, and what have our departments of student personnel done to get rid of this vestigial organ that comes from another world and that doesn't belong in our world at all? The answer is obvious.

There's just one example, I think, of an irrelevant agency that we continue because it was brought into our world with the logic of university paralleling. This type of thinking has been in a sense the arch enemy of our faith. The very notion of university parallels has brought into our institutions student personnel departments that look like four-year student personnel departments, admissions offices that look like collegiate admissions offices, faculty ranking, academic departments, the semester system, the credit hour, the whole apparatus of the senior college world which really have little or nothing to do with what we are supposed to be accomplishing for our communities and for our new student cadres.

I think we need to ask our graduate schools for a new grammar, for some new techniques, for some new languages that point our attention to different ways of doing the job. I've listed some cliches here that have had meaning for me. You know, the terms change, "excellence" becomes the term "dialogue," "innovation" and so on, and then someone satirizes the terms by saying we're abusing them and they become code words and they have no meaning. I think the most important words of any era are the cliches because they tell you what you are trying to pay attention to. So here are some of the cliches that I'm struggling with because I think they point to significant possibilities for the future of the community college.

I like the word "innovation." I think it's a better cliche than the word "excellence" because excellence keeps suggesting ways of compelling others, ways of doing the neatest most outstanding job. I like "innovation" because it just keeps reminding us that we have to change and I know we have to change and the word "innovation" keeps at us to do so.

I like the cliche of the "experimental college" because that keeps reminding us that we really don't know how to educate any better than we do. We don't really know if education by television or the computer or the inquiry method or independent study or community service or any of these notions will do any better job than current instruction strategies. The idea of the "experimental college" was that we ought to turn our institutions into places where it is fun to try and if we try these things, even if most of them end up being marked "no significant difference," we might have some fun, we might find that we've institutionalized the Hawthorne effect so that there is excitement and energy on campus as we experiment.

I like very much the cliche and work that is going on, the new language that talks about "student subcultures." I think this is terribly important and helpful. We hear about the cliche of "life styles" and we hear about "learning styles" and I am trying, as an administrator, to understand what all these terms mean.

Previous languages made us sort students according to academic ability or according to career intention, an example, electrical technology students versus transfer students. These new taxonomies of "student subcultures" are suggesting to us that there are some students who are vocationally oriented and different from the students who are academically oriented that there are still students who are very collegiate who like proms and pennants and games, and that they're different from the activist students who want to learn through their glands and through acts of some sort, who are in turn very different from the alienated students, the psychedelic students who really may not want to go into the community and observe at all, but want to go into their own heads either through music or poetry or drugs. If we have on our campus all of these student subcultures and if the other cliche of "learning styles" suggests to us that these various kinds of students learn differently, I begin to see some possibility for institutional reform.

I like the next term I have on vocabulary rhetoric which is "learning environment." It's the opposite of "student subcultures" because that suggests that colleges, different colleges like different towns and different churches and different homes, have different environments and

and that these environments are terribly important, maybe more important than the formal curriculum and that the environment is capable of change. We're getting awfully conscious of ecology. For example, two community colleges may both offer freshman English, but Community College A is a barren and arid environment, no pictures on the wall and no poetry in the halls and no music and no discussion or controversy in the auditorium. Institution B is a rich and exciting and swinging environment for students, plus there is debate and there are posters and that freshman English takes differently at different institutions not because of the curriculum content but because of the environmental contents. This helps me because it turns my attention, makes me look at what the architecture says to students and what the posters say and whether or not the cultural program suggests that our community college is really concerned with the issues of the day.

I like the term "cluster colleges" and I like the term "curriculum options." The term "cluster college" suggests that it's possible for a large institution, and all of our community colleges are getting to be large institutions, to break up into smaller subunits, and maybe some of these subunits can be organized around the differences in "student subcultures." Maybe if we're "blue skying" we can have square community colleges for the square student and vocational community college for the vocational students and hip community college for the alienated students and community service community college for the activist students. If we could learn to find the students who were activists before they get to us, maybe we could put them into activity kind of curricula. We can't do that now because we don't have the student personnel technology yet. All our students do is to fill out an application blank which says that they're interested in liberal arts and that they have a seventy-five high school average. We're not yet at the point where we can do any of this kind of work.

The notion of "curriculum options" I like because it suggests that rather than our having these intense faculty-administration-student arguments about whether we should have a wholly prescribed program of general study, or independent study or community centered programs, that maybe we ought to have a wholly prescribed program in general education modelled after the St. John's Great Books program for those students who would flourish under such a program. And maybe we ought to have another program of independent study for the students who would flourish under such a progeam and maybe we ought to have a totally vocationalized curriculum for other students. And just maybe we ought to give up the kind of moral imperialism which we are all guilty of which says that this is *the* kind of curriculum, these are the hallmarks of the educated persons, these are the standards and the forms that should be imposed on all students.

The notion of "student subcultures" suggests the differentiated and plural student community. The notions of "cluster colleges" and "curriculum option" suggest the possibility that we might design different curriculums for different cultures. The notion of counseling suggests that some day our student personnel people, instead of doing whatever it is that they do now, might help us to identify the learning styles of the students who come to us and help encourage students with certain styles to take advantage of the options we have created for them in the new set of possibilities that we're talking about.

The new notion would be that of a community college that would have to use all of the resources for learning that are available in the community; the churches, the banks, the industries, the political organizations, because obviously we couldn't duplicate all of these for our activist students on campus.

The institution would then use this next cliche, an "extended campus." It would itself be a very rich and plural environment offering many curricular options with a whole gamut of learning styles that exist out there. It would be the function of the new kind of student personnel department to match learning styles and curriculum options. If we could learn, if we would be willing administratively to break up the existing, coherent, well-organized structure and fractionate it into this pluralist kind of environment, we might begin to realize some of the articles of our faith.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

MR. KLEGMAN: Under this concept that you present now, do you need two years of work to get an A.A. degree? How do we know when the student has completed his degree work?

DR. ESKOW: I don't really know. One possibility is you get ten faculty members and say that you're Alpha College and you are interested in creating a college for the activist students. We let them work up a curriculum on program studies, and we tell them not to get hung up on this Associate in Arts degree. I really don't know the answer, but I think one of the things that I would want to do is not to allow that to become an important question. I don't know how to prevent it from becoming an important question.

DR. FARRIS: Isn't part of the student's education to come in contact with all kinds of students whether they're activists, whether they're square, whether they're hip, whether they're black, whatever the students are? I should think one of the major functions would be to turn out a whole person and not just a person who wants to learn what he wants to learn. A student should come in contact with real life and real life patterns in all kinds of persons. I don't think the idea of having separate colleges for different kinds of students is a wholesome thing.

DR. ESKOW: I think that's a very serious and valid objection. If you know someone is an authoritarian personality, should you put him in with other authoritarians? If there are certain people who really can only learn when the teacher orders and regulates their lives and they kind of go to pieces in a Socratic discussion of free inquiry, should you put them in an orderly classroom or should you expose them to the threatening situation? In other words, this is a variation on your question which is part of the problem with my notion.

To what extent do you want to mix the types of people with the values that clash with confrontation and dissidence built in and to what extent is that what's got us paralyzed right now.

DR. COLLINS: We do this right now with a tracking system, we do it along the lines of a particular human quality that we happen to value in the academic aptitude. And we say if you're at such and such a level you'll go down this track, and that in effect becomes a segregated system. I think it makes every bit as good sense to allow, if I may use the word, a kind of self-segregation. Why not?

PROF. ALDINGTON: What I like about your proposal is that the subculture is the place where the persons are really turned on, alive, and active. Where the educational structure breaks up the subculture in order to transmit education, something very valuable is really lost. At the same time, I respond to Dr. Farris' question, and I'm not able in my mind to put the two things together without moving one or the other.

DR. ESKOW: I guess everybody is personally partial. I was one of those who hated college. I hated my first two years and at one point at Berkeley, a long time ago before the revolution, I became part of the little theater subculture, a self-segregated group of people who were unified by their conviction that they were going to revolutionize the theatrical world. We put on plays, we discussed them and we were a little entity. That little, whole, segregated world became the college experience for me and turned me on. The journalism kids found their colleagues and other kids were lucky enough to get hooked by something else. So there was an awful lot of self-segregation going on.

I sometimes have the feeling that it's the kids who don't find a culture they enjoy who are the ones not turned on. Recognizing the danger in what we're talking about, it is experimenting with what happens when you use the resource of the institution, which actually creates student cultures. I don't know what would happen, it might have some very negative effects.

MR. REAVIS: What is the role of the college president in terms of what you're saying right now? What is his role in making this thing happen or come about, in making the community college what it's supposed to be, a comprehensive operation. Is his role limited; is he in a position to manipulate the situation to make it what it's supposed to be?

DR. ESKOW: The president uses moral suasion in the budget and whatever levers he's got to make things happen, recognizing always that there are many other countervailing powers, constituencies and forces that have always got to be recognized. Therefore, the process of change, institutional change, is very often slow. Many people in the community really want to believe that if the establishment, the president, had the vision, he could change the college, turn the college around tomorrow. If he was the authoritarian with the authoritarian budget power that's popularly ascribed to him, I guess he could, but there are so many consultations that must go on, there are so many committees including now the collective bargaining process that all you can do is feed ideas of this kind into the hopper, put as much urgency and moral suasion behind them as you can, and hope for the best.

MR. PATTERSON: Do you find many people agreeing with you, with your concept that the graduate school ought to be changed to help bring this about? In other words, do you see a hope that his will happen in the next ten of fifteen years?

DR. ESKOW: I'm a little disillusioned with the graduate schools. They talk about community colleges, but they're really looking at the colleges that exist in the literature and discussing Jesse Bogue, and talking about terminal and transfer, and all sorts of weird notions that really no longer have any relevance to the world as it exists.

MR. PATTERSON: Your faculty come from them and your faculty are making the college image, so in effect, the graduate schools are perpetuating the situation.

DR. ESKOW: Absolutely, and our faculty members come from institutions which themselves are not using new instructional methods. Where is a faculty going to learn about the new media? Where is it going to learn about the lot inquiry method? Where is it going to learn about independent studies? It doesn't learn it in graduate school because the most they do is talk about these things. Until there is real reform in the graduate school, I see very little hope for help coming from that quarter.

DR. COLLINS: Of course, the worst sin of the graduate school is to imbue the faculty member with an identification of his discipline as opposed to indentification with the goals of the community college, the goals of education. I come from a graduate school, and I think your indictment is mild. It could be a good deal stronger than that.

What if you abandoned the graduate schools other than for preparation of a person with a body of knowledge in a specialty area--hoping that in those five or six years the person might get a decent general education. Beyond that, you undertake to prepare your faculty members yourself for their role in the community college. You would set up, in addition to the dean of instruction, a staff person who would be prepared in educational philosophy and in the whole learning-teaching equation, and he would be in charge of a program of preparation for the people you would hire. The people that you would hire would be youngsters right out of the graduate schools, and, consequently, you would get them cheap. I mean, they would be at the bottom of your salary schedule. You would hire them under an internship credential as opposed to a straight teaching credential that would carry with it an instant tenure. You would have them for a year, and you would make this kind of an investment in them. Instead of giving them fifteen hours to teach, which almost assures their failure during the first year, if you had a quarter system, you would start them out with six hours of teaching,one preparation, two different classes in the same thing. You would have a constant and thorough-going inservice training program in philosophy of education and learning theory carried on by the person from the office of instruction. In the second quarter you would add a second preparation and perhaps in the third quarter you would add still another preparation, but keep it at about nine hours so that in the first year a person would have a chance to be imbued really with, what you call, sort of an orthodoxy of community college philosophy. He would be able to look to his mentor, a philosopher-educational theorist, as well as having someone within his general areas of competence working with him.

It seems to me that although that's initially expensive for a district, if, in fact, you did this whole hog and did it well, those people would be with you for the next ten or twenty years with a junior college philosophy and with some real preparation in the whole art and science of teaching. In the long run this might pay off.

DR. ESKOW: I think the notion, as I understand it, of hiring young people and in a sense preparing them ourselves, makes much good sense. The notion of having on our staff the people who are prepared to offer this training also makes good sense. The one part of our present structure that might impinge on the possibility is the typical collegiate departmental structure which might clash with the notion because the English Department pretends, let's say, that it is the one that is going to induct the new English teacher into the mysteries of freshman composition. Sometimes some of us suspect that they don't know how to teach students how to write or read at all except at their own kinds of colleges. I think your proposal would work very well if the departments were prepared and if we were able to break through the grasp of the departments on the new instructional process.

DR. COLLINS: How are you going to beat this other problem which is both messy and complicated? What are the other options? You said, in effect, that the faculty is put in on faith. How do you mean that?

DR. ESKOW: I don't mean that as deliberate ideological subversion. I'm just saying they don't know any better. I mean I taught the way I was taught. How else can you teach? They subvert because they bring into the institution their education and their dreams of being in a fashionable parish with the students of like mind and like talents. Here, they are out of their area with new kinds of 'ignorant' students who can't read and can't write, who won't share their values, and so this is a tough situation for most new faculty people, consequently, they do subvert.

DR. COLLINS: And the next question is what are the options, what do you do about it?

DR. ESKOW: One of the hopes in this notion of segregating by cultures is that if you have some romantic, revolutionary faculty members and their student counterparts working together in a cluster college, at least part of the time, maybe the two life styles, of the faculty members and the students, are compatible, maybe they will create an exciting and stimulating environment for students and faculty. If you have the rationalist occupationally-oriented faculty people working with their kinds of students, doing their kinds of thing, maybe it would work a little better, too. Maybe it's all this confusion of life styles that somewhat needs rearranging. I think in a very real sense that although this notion is very abstract and very idealistic,it speaks to one possibility for the seventies.

This cliche of "doing your own thing" which the kids no longer use, but now the adults are starting to pick up, does suggest to me that in the past if you were the kind of young man who wanted a certain kind of life style in college and you could afford it, you went to Antioch or you went to another community, to St. John's, or you went to Harvard, and so forth and so on. If you were rich enough and mobile enough in America, you could find your life style somewhere in the country. All I'm really suggesting is that maybe what we've got to do for the seventies--this is a prediction--is to create in each community for our kind of student, for poor people, the kinds of human options for freedom, for variety, that you've always had if you were rich. We create it right in our own hometown. We create a little Antioch, a little St. John's and a little this and a little that, and a little Dartmouth in the town for those who can take it. We create a little, perhaps not so little, complex world of all these options in one piece of territory and that's a community college. Therefore, all our students are going to enjoy that type of life diversity that was formerly a possibility for the privileged few. I think that's part of what people are really demanding in the 1970's, new possibilities of freedom, new possibilities of choice. This might be in one sense a response.

MR. REAVIS: Is this possibly where the concept of urban colleges of technology could come into being? Colleges dealing with specifics of a given urban area based on needs.

DR. ESKOW: That's one possibility, one kind of college, one kind of curriculum option for one kind of student. I wouldn't force it on anybody. I wouldn't force it on all. The notion that a college of technology is right for all minority or disadvantaged students doesn't make any sense to me. It's right for some students, whether you call it a cluster college or whether you just say that one of the possibilities in each community ought to be a place where you can go to learn a useful skill or a trade without necessarily being encumbered by abstract literary and linguistic pursuit.

MR. REAVIS: Also we could tie into the idea of making the college comprehensive in nature which has been missed basically in most high schools today. The fact is high schools are turning out students who don't have a competence in any area, let alone a comprehensive background.

DR. WOLFBEIN: On most points I am a generalist. I do not know enough about community colleges to say.

I'm wondering whether graduate schools were really that adamant about providing the instructional resources which would be flexible enough to do this sort of thing. The faculty are complaining, viable or not, that they're not getting communication from the community colleges on what they really want. At least we'd like to make a try in the seventies at providing that instruction of personnel you need to have. I think graduate school students have the eye out too, and they would like to try this.

PROF. HANSON: One of the things that we have talked about a lot in education is letting people try things and discovering they're wrong because wrong in college means very little. Whereas, you get a person who has been forty years in business administration who discovers he likes art, that is a tragedy. The community colleges have a beautiful chance to let people sample at a much more primitive level, still maintaining the breadth of education which they have a unique opportunity to give students, but letting students try things, letting them move back and forth between departments. At this moment in time we in New York State don't even allow students to move back and forth between community colleges.

After working for a year and a half on the two-year, four-year articulation problems, I was horrified to find that our school had turned down somebody coming back from New Paltz because of some incredibly little deficiency. If mobility is one of the things this world is going to demand, and I think it is, then we owe these kids a chance to practice mobility. What do you lose if you lose a year? This is your point whether we are talking about a two-year degree or talking about a student who is ready to move.

In the community college we have less precedent, we have a good opportunity to do innovative things in education because we are between--we are betwixt and between.

DR. WOLFBEIN: We have just initiated a program at Temple University which a student can cover in five years instead of four. What's the big rush? It seems to me that if you can do it at the collegiate level, you can do it at all levels.

DR. ESKOW: I would like to say one thing about this point you've been discussing here. You have suggested that we really have all these multiplicities of options now, the school of business and the school of this, and what are we really talking about? Two things: I want to be as operational and specific as I can. We're talking about two-year colleges, lower division colleges, freshman and sophomore colleges, and we don't typically have those results of freedom. Typically at our institution the freshman student takes English I, History of Western Civilization I, Language I and Psychology I; that's it. And where are the options? Now, instead of History of Western Civilization I, under certain circumstances he can take Sociology I. Instead of French I he can take Spanish I and instead of Biology I he can take Phsysics I, but if you accept my notion that these are all rather rationalized, college-based, classroom-based experiences, those are choices that don't really make a difference to the student. He cannot choose, for example, to study abroad or to move into the community, or not to take science at all, so what I'm suggesting is that at the community colleges we have pseudo-choices.

Secondly, I think at the senior institution, your own listing of choices were all professional choices. You can choose to be in the School of Engineering or in the School of Liberal Arts. This is the way we have optionalized our existing institutions. What people are suggesting is that there might be different principles around which we can organize rather than career choices. But putting that aside, we do not have these varieties of choice and possibility and life style at our institution. It's all pretty much History of Western Civilization I, or if you're in a career program, Electricity I.

MR. REAVIS: In the light of the Governor's most recent message on full opportunity in education, there is one serious consideration the community colleges are going to have to face. How many of these community colleges are going to be faced with the problem of working with people who have not been able to get a high school equivalency diploma or a certificate, and to a great extent want the same services? Because many of the community colleges haven't been able successfully to work with students who have graduated without the traditional credentials. This question, I think, needs to be asked and replies given.

DR. ESKOW: You're saying we haven't really known how to work with these people, and, therefore, how are we going to know how to teach new kinds of people with lesser credentials than our present students.

MR. REAVIS: Right.

DR. ESKOW: Right you are.

II. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT AND THE 1970'S

SOME STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL

Charles C. Collins

Dr. Collins, now Associate Director of the Junior College Leadership Program, University of California at Berkeley, has for years been a national junior college leader. He received his Ph.D. degree at Stanford University. Nationally Dr. Collins has served as a consultant on the organization and development of junior colleges; internationally, he worked with the staff in the Ministry of Education in Ceylon organizing five experimental junior university colleges. Dr. Collins assembled the material from the Carnegie Project on Junior College Student Personnel Programs into the study JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS, WHAT THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY SHOULD BE.

The eminent biologist, Thomas Henry Huxley, once told his students, "The great end of life is not knowledge but action." And W. H. Auden said to all who read his poetry: "Act from thought should quickly follow: What is thinking for?"

Facts left in isolation, are inert. Drawing implications from facts, though hazardous, creates a ferment with a potential for thrust toward action. Thought centered on these implications should give direction to this potential thrust. The sequential order, then, is: facts--implications drawn from facts--thought on suggested options and their consequences--action. Or, related to the subject at hand; facts on junior college students--implications of these facts for student personnel services--thought on the consequences of the options these implications suggest--development, innovation, change, action.

Facts, even in the social or behavioral sciences, can be hard, neat, precise, objective. Implications grow out of the perceptions of the person drawing them, hence are softer, perhaps a little messy, somewhat imprecise, and admittedly subjective. It might be comforting could it be otherwise, but it cannot. The validity of the implications will depend on the breadth and depth of the contextual knowledge of the person who draws these implications--and upon his unstated assumptions and the internal logic that follows from these assumptions. Step three of the sequential order, (thought on the consequence of the options suggested by the implications,) and step four, (action,) go beyond the responsibility of the gatherer of facts or the drawer of implications. At least in matters pertaining to curriculum or student personnel, step three and step four must be taken by those who know all the complexities and nuances of the local situation and who will have to carry out and live with the action which is taken.

ACADEMIC CHARACTERISTICS

For an opener, take the fact that more and more people are going to college: the three percent going to college in 1900 has grown to fifty percent in the 1960's; an average of one new junior college is created every week; presidents of the United States as well as presidents of colleges have said that

---

This paper, presented to the seminar, will be included in *Junior College Student Personnel Work: Practice and Potential*, edited by Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston to be published by Prentice-Hall, Inc.

everyone who wants and can profit from higher education should have it. What are the implications of this colossal fact?

When 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent of high school graduates are enrolled in college, most will not be going to such institutions as Stanford or Yale or the University of California. These millions will be swelling the ranks of the community colleges. In California, for example, 60 percent of the high school graduates now enter a two or four-year college. In 1968, total enrollment was 878,580 students of whom 568,147 were in California's 86 community colleges as opposed to 98,780 students in the eight campuses of the University of California.

When higher education is almost as universal as secondary education, the college population will, in nearly all respects, be the same as that found in the high schools. On the scale of academic aptitude, the junior college average may actually be lower than that of the high school, for the people's college will have abandoned whatever selection processes they may have had, while the state and private four-year colleges and universities will continue to skim off the academic cream. Of course, both junior and senior colleges may come to see that man is not one-dimensional, that he is a lot more than just his academic aptitude. The community colleges may make reappraisal, come to see that academic aptitude is only one of the many facets of man, and realize that by opening the door to everybody, they have allowed all the plural riches of humanity to flow in.

If community colleges make such a reappraisal, they may decide to go off the academic gold standard. They may begin looking for more valuable gems: social ethics, human understanding, ethnic subcultures, affective wisdom. They may tell the senior colleges that they are not looking for academic excellence alone and therefore refuse to use the single A-to-F yardstick to measure a student. Junior college instructors and student personnel workers may teach their more rigid senior college colleagues that the plural qualities of man require plural modes of cultivation and call for plural criteria of evaluation. As a more and more diverse population swarms into the junior colleges, there will have to be an institutional re-ordering of priorities with some de-emphasis on the academic, on cognitive learning, and a new valuation of affective learning, a new concern with human relationships and with the morality and ethics involved in those relationships.

The valuation of human qualities by counselors and other student personnel workers has already undergone significant reappraisal. Those in the vanguard have sought means (course work, self-analysis, encounter groups) to broaden their knowledge of meaningful ways to release and develop the varied qualities they find in their students. They have disabused themselves of the single-standard definition of college and find it arrogant, if not absurd, when others speak of a course being "college level" or of a student being "college-calibre."

RESISTANCE TO TESTING

The antagonism toward testing has grown so strong that testmakers have become anxious about loss of handsome profits. Community college professionals in student personnel are asking, "Who needs selection devices in an open-door college?" And their few counterparts in the more selective senior colleges are asking, "Are we not measureing that which happens to be measureable rather than that which is significant?". Some student personnel people in the junior colleges are objecting that the tracking system should be allowed to die a well-deserved death, but that testing props it up and makes a moribund system look viable. Those professionals most disenchanted with testing claim that the achievement testmakers become the curriculum committee determining what will be taught, and that the academic aptitude testmakers jerry-rig a facade of scientific legitimacy to justify the one-eyed view that the cognitive, the academic, is the be-all and end-all of the college experience.

Criticism of testing by the professionals is genteel and decorous compared to the bad-mouthing by disadvantaged Blacks, Browns, and Whites who feel they have been victimized by testing. To many of those with rising educational and vocational expectations, testing has been used by the haves to make the have-nots doubt their own competency, to make their self-image ugly, to pile failure upon failure, and to make school a foreign game where the ground rules are fixed to make them lose. Much of this negative feeling toward testing has rubbed off on the counselors, contributing significantly to the low esteem in which they are held by many Blacks and others from the Third World. The up-shot of all this is that student personnel people find themselves in a professional quandry: they know that some testing, particularly in the affective areas of attitudes, interests and values, is of real worth, and they do not want to throw the good out with the bad. At the same time, they know they will be obliged not only to take the threat out of testing but to demonstrate its positive values if they are ever to recapture the trust of Blacks, Chicanos, and others who see tests as the switch used to shunt them off onto dead-end tracks.

SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Junior college students, as a group, come from families in the lower socioeconomic classes. Put more accurately, the educations, incomes, and occupations of their fathers are lower than those of fathers of most four-year college students.[2] If this is true now, it is going to be more true in the future, for the middle and upper classes have always sent their children to college, while the children of the lower-middle and lower classes make up the bulk of the astonishing number and percentage increase in enrollment in higher education. Third World militancy on the issue of education may beat down closed doors and may throw a wedge into those revolving doors designed to make exit follow hard on the heels of entry.

This palpable fact of socioeconomic class has some subtle and perplexing implications for student personnel. The junior colleges have with pride staked a claim on the democratization of higher education. Community colleges allege, although Burton Clark and others have questioned it, that they are the escalator upon which those students who can hang on, can ride to whatever class level they choose.[4] Even if this is true, it becomes an area of concern for counseling. Those who move out of their class divorce themselves somewhat from the parents, family, and friends they leave behind. This cannot be done without some feeling of guilt and some emotional losses.

Students who are upwardly mobile need, in a self-conscious way, to take a hard look at what is happening to them and to make some studied choices in class values. It does not necessarily follow that the student must first learn and then adopt the values of the higher class to which he is moving. A strong case could be made for his learning a greater appreciation of the values, mores, traditions of the class, or caste, or sub-culture, from which he comes. Perhaps this is what the struggle for Ethnic Studies is all about. Maybe the Black student does not want to divorce himself from his Black heritage, and maybe the Chicano student wants to hold to the values of La Raza. Maybe, too, the White student should undertake his own ethnic studies by casting a critical look at the life style of the middle and upper class WASP.

The college experience, the whole academic ethos, is so foreign to those parents who have had no contact with it, that is is difficult for them to give understanding and encouragement to their college-bound children. In a general way, they want their children to "get ahead" and even to surpass them. However, they find moment-to-moment encouragement difficult: like an American trying to cheer enthusiastically at a British cricket match. They also find a widening gulf between themselves and their children, who may correct their grammar, reject their politics, and scoff at their religion. But to return to the point at hand: encouragement of influential and understanding adults is a vital factor in the motivation of college students.[13] If the psycho-logic of circumstances disqualifies the parents as the significant adults, then the student personnel staff should conjure up some parent surrogates to provide this intelligent encouragement.

Although social mobility does not necessarily require rejection of existing values and on-going cultural patterns, college as the vehicle for social mobility should lead to broader interests, to more catholic tastes, to partaking in a richer cultural fare. The formal curriculum can only take the student part way toward this goal. Junior colleges, even more than senior colleges, should develop and financially underwrite such an attractive co-curricular program that it will seduce even the practical-minded, working, commuting student. As a matter of fact, it is just such a student who should be exposed to an enticing motley of new ideas and life styles, and lured into new cultural and intellectual experiences.

FINANCES

It is an irony that many students select the junior college because of its low cost and then discount the education they get because it is "on the cheap." Further, 63 percent of junior college students, as opposed to 18 percent of senior college students, work while attending college. The basis for their dividing time and energy between work and college is partly need and partly this discounting of the seriousness of the enterprise.[2]

At the moment, it is part of Black and Third World rhetoric to label junior college education second-rate because the junior college is lower in cost and because it admits virtually everyone. This reflects one of the neurotic valuations of a materialistic society: if it is cheaper and if it is not selective, it must not be very good. Some counter must be made to the materialistic tendency to judge things good or bad, valuable or worthless, on the basis of what they cost. Since it is among the functions of student personnel to interpret the college to the student, and to help the student explore the effect of his value system on his behavior, this whole problem falls directly in the laps of the various student personnel workers, particularly in the laps of the counselors.

Financial aid officers have an even tougher job. More academically disadvantaged students from poorer families, particularly Black and other Third World students, are entering the community colleges. Helping them find jobs does not solve the problem, for time on the job is time away from study. If they work enough to earn subsistence, they are likely to flunk out of college. There are only token amounts of grants-in-aid to meet the need, and the scramble for the few dollars thrown out by the Federal Government is both humiliating and cutthroat. The issues of financial aid--insufficient funds, unmet promises, sudden cutbacks, withholding of aid as a punitive measure--have already resulted in the eruption of violence on some campuses and, predictably, will be the source of many confrontations in the future.

The notion that a student who works his way through college gets more out of it and appreciates it more probably never was true. Now, for most junior college students, it is a grim joke. There is no evidence that working while enrolled in a junior college builds character, but there is evidence that it results in lower academic achievement and a higher drop-out rate.[10] No doubt, student personnel departments should include an employment office and the more able student probably can handle fifteen or twenty hours of work per week. Nonetheless, major attention must be turned to campaigning for adequate financial aid, perhaps on a work-study program where the academically strong student is paid for being a tutor and the academically weak student is paid for being a tutee. Community fund-raising drives may generate a thousand dollars or so for an emergency loan fund, but the kind of campaign being suggested is a political one where the stakes are for millions of Federal or state dollars. Failure on this issue may indeed make the revolution of rising expectations into a bloody one.

VALUES, SELF-CONCEPT, AND PERSONALITY

As a group, junior college students are not committed to intellectual values; they do not seek an intellectual atmosphere, nor do they find it.[8] This is true despite the fact that most junior colleges serve the academically oriented (transfer) better than the vocationally oriented (terminal). The typical junior college student's outside work, his commuting, his high school background, the interests and value patterns of his family--all of these are contributing factors. The fact remains, however, that values are a strong determinant of behavior, and unless a student does come to value intellectual pursuits, his moment-to-moment motivation in enterprises of the mind is not likely to be strong.

To a large extent, what is described here is a restriction of freedom. The usual junior college student does not seek option B (intellectual--cultural activities) because he is much more aware of option A (practical--materialistic activities). To increase his freedom, he needs to be made more aware of the alternatives open to him. And these alternatives need to be experienced as pleasure, to bring him reward, not just present themselves as onerous requirements he must meet to get the ticket to a better job and to more material benefits. What is being suggested is that the co-curriculum within the student personnel function can more than supplement; it can be an equal partner with the formal curriculum in the development of intellectual-cultural values. This program so fascinates with intriguing personalities, can so delight with the pleasures of the arts, can so broaden the student's world with its diversity, and can so stimulate the imagination that only the case-hardened know-nothing will be able to escape its lure. Further, those student personnel people involved in the co-curriculum can encourage students to band together for the pleasure of shared experience in the intellectual-cultural realm. They can help create on the junior college campus what spontaneously arises on the university campus, namely, little communities of people who feel comradeship and pleasure from the shared experience of a common interest.

Junior college students more or less comprise a cross section of the general population and hence should not be thought of as a homogenous group. Even so, there are some measureable group differences between them and senior college students. They appear to have a more practical orientation to college and are less likely to value humanitarian pursuits. They are more cautious and controlled, lack confidence in themselves, are less likely to venture into new and untried fields; they seek more certain pathways to the occupational success and financial security which they value so highly. They are, from the research evidence, less autonomous and more authoritarian.[7]

As might be guessed, junior college students appear to be more unsettled about future plans than either four-year college students or than youngsters who do not go on to college. Actually, they are eager for guidance regarding future planning even though they may not have the initiative, the confidence, or the know-how to seek it out. It is congruent with all the other facts that those planning and transfering to senior colleges make more use of the counseling services and are more pleased with them than the non-transfer students.[8]

All of these statements should carry a rather loud and clear message to student personnel workers. Certainly there is agreement on the goals of helping the student to become more autonomous and less authoritarian, of increasing his self-confidence, of helping him to see and be willing to consider bolder options. There is a need to take counseling, particularly the value analysis involved in vocational counseling, to the student. If the students won't come to the counselors, then the counselors must go to the students. One way to assure this is to decentralize so the counselors must leave the security of the fort, the barrier of their little cluster of offices, and team up with their faculty colleagues in divisional centers spotted throughout the campus. Or if this is not the way to put the counselors where the action is, then let them find some other natural clustering so they are readily accessible to the students who need and want their help.

Counselors should help keep junior college students from settling too quickly for the commonplace. They need to help them to learn to live with ambiguity: to help them see that vocational choice should begin with an imaginative look at a host of options and should then proceed toward a progressive narrowing of choice as the person analyzes the congruence of his own values, interests, and abilities with those demanded by various occupations. The most valuable thing the student can learn in this whole process is the attitude, the posture, of commitment within a wider frame of tentativeness.[9] But this is difficult. "Almost all students and some counselors will expect a definite, almost irrevocable, occupational decision as the end result of vocational counseling. Considering the truth that

'There is nothing permanent except change,' this is an impossible, and really foolish expectancy. The whole concept of work is going to change. The nature of occupations will change even more rapidly than in the recent past. The prediction that 50 percent of all jobs a decade hence will be jobs that are not known today, will come to pass. In such a changing environment, the individual himself is going to change, to be transformed, to undergo a veritable metamorphosis. Yet, like all before him, he will have to live the days of his years; he will need to be committed for today yet remain tentative for tomorrow."[5]

Junior college students are often quite uncertain of their interests and doubt if they have the motivation to sustain them through a full college program. Many do not feel confident that their high school work prepared them adequately for college. They are more critical of the high school courses and teachers than are those who go directly to four-year colleges. They estimate that their teachers would rate them lower and, in fact, agree that their teachers should rate them lower.[8] All of this, of course, adds up to a self-fulfilling prophecy. Too frequently, the junior college student begins with doubts, sinks to depression, and then stops trying in areas where he experiences little, if any, success. The vicious cycle can only be broken if instructors, counselors, and other student personnel workers begin to insist that self-judgment and evaluation by others be made on a more pluralistic basis.

Obviously, those with high aptitude and lots of experience in manipulation of verbal and mathematical symbols are going to shine like Day-Glo if the learning experience is all at the highest level of abstraction. But symbol manipulation is not the only form of learning. Perceptive Blacks living in the ghetto understand the sociology of that sub-culture in a different and probably more significant way than the White student who has read all the books on it. John Dewey called for learning by doing, and Paul Goodman appears ready to write off most of learning at second or third or nth level abstraction and substitute a Twentieth Century version of the apprenticeship system.[9]

Of course, student personnel workers cannot wait for a radical revamping of higher education; in the long meantime they must arrange for a goodly portion (25 percent to 35 percent) of junior college students to develop skill in handling the written and spoken words and the mathematical symbols. In accommodating themselves to this reality, they should still keep pointing to the absurdity of a college which accepts all comers but maintains the narrow learning system and an even narrower evaluation system designed to serve elitist colleges. Junior college students could learn psychology and sociology and government and ecology and ethics and all the arts and a lot of other subdivisions of man's knowledge by experiencing them, by participation, by doing; if learning were this real, they would not tolerate for long an evaluation system as one-dimensional and as meaningless as A-to-F.

EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

"Generally speaking, junior college students have lower educational and occupational aspirations than their peers who begin their education in four-year colleges."[8] Most observers find this understandable, although they might ask what is meant by "lower." What they cannot find understandable is that 70 to 75 percent of junior college freshmen assert their intention to transfer to a senior college and earn a bachelor's degree or more. Most observers of the junior college scene echo the statement made by K. Patricia Cross, "We know, of course, that the educational aspirations of both junior and senior college students are unrealistically high."[8] And they agree with what Burton Clark called the "cooling out" function of higher education, junior colleges using the soft response: "...to let down hopes gently and unexplosively. Through it, students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined."[3]

It is a fact that 70 to 75 percent of beginning junior college students label themselves as transfer students, whereas 35 percent or fewer of these students actually transfer.[1] Is the implication of this fact that counselors should disuade all but top academic students from taking transfer courses? Let the charge be loud and clear: on this issue, junior college staff, including those in student personnel, fall into their own semantic traps. They ask a premature, value-loaded, badly-phrased question and then give face validity to the answer. When a student is asked if his major goal is terminal or transfer he is really being asked, "Are your vocational and educational aims highly specific and limited or are they still rather general and unlimited?" If the student is uncommitted, or if his commitment is to general education, of if he doesn't know whether he will eventually be a data processor or a teacher of data processing, or if he likes the sound of saying he is going on to Princeton, or if he wants to keep the options open or if, in hard fact, he fully intends to transfer--under all these conditions, the student is likely to label himself as a transfer student. When the terminal/transfer dichotomy really means low-prestige-specific versus high-prestige-general, it should not be so astonishing that 70 to 75 percent are smart enough to make the second choice.

It is also a fact that junior colleges, like senior colleges, "cool out" their students, perhaps more gently but just as effectively. To say that junior colleges use the soft response, ("let down hopes gently and unexplosively,--students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined") is to indulge in conscience-soothing euphemisms. It should be put more harshly: out of every 100 students who enter junior colleges, 65 to 70 say, "Oh, to hell with it!" or, by means of probation/disqualification, are told by those who piously espouse universal higher education "Get the hell out!" Either way, this is somewhat analogous to hospitals discharging the sick and keeping the well.

Part of the error in this thinking begins with the assumption that there is a clear-cut distinction between terminal and transfer. This is a myth without foundation. Most terminal courses in vocational training are as difficult and demanding as transfer courses: industrial electronics is every bit as tough as History 17 A-B. Most courses with terminal numbers are, in fact, transferable to one senior college or another, and, since this is true, instructors teaching these courses apply what they think to be transfer grading standards. Add to these points the fact that the general education function of the junior college is, with few exceptions, met by transfer type courses. The logic of these assertions leads then to this: if transfer courses are unrealistic (too difficult) for two-thirds of junior college students, if most technical-terminal courses are as difficult as transfer courses, if most general education courses are really designed and graded as transfer courses, then for two-thirds of the students the transfer, the terminal, and the general education functions of the junior college are all unrealistic. By this reasoning, it would make more sense--and would be cheaper--for the academically able students to be sent directly from high school to the senior colleges. The junior colleges would then be left as remedial schools trying to do what the elementary and secondary schools failed to do.

Again, it comes to this: the idea of universal higher education demands a plural, not a single, absolute definition of what college is. Student personnel workers should be the first to exorcise that devilish mind-set that transfer is unrealistic for many, if not most, junior college students. What is really unrealistic is for an affluent society to fail to educate each of its citizens to his highest potential, for it is self-evident that this serves both the individual and the general welfare.

Counselors and other junior college staff members should first resist and then reject this artificial distinction between transfer and terminal. Student personnel staff members should work with curriculum committees and with instructors on disabusing students, and their parents, of the vision of step-ladder prestige in society's job structure. They should actively set out to instill a higher valuation for para-professional and for all mid-level jobs in management, in technology, and in the social services, for in the economy of the future that is where most junior college graduates are going to be. If all of the above reasoning is essentially sound, then the most important implication is the necessity of convincing senior colleges to broaden their range of curricula to accept a much broadened range of transfer students. They should find, as the junior colleges are finding, that the definition of college has to stretch to fit the new societal goal of universal higher education.

BLACK AND THIRD WORLD STUDENTS

The head-count facts on Black and Third World students are not yet documented, but it would take an hysterical blindness to fail to see that the junior colleges, particularly urban community colleges, are getting and will get more Black, Brown, Yellow, and Red students. The militancy of those already in is going to force changes in admissions, retention, financial aid, and other such barriers, so the way will be cleared for the brothers who are on the outside. Many are going to enter very hostile about the kind of counseling and the kind of teaching they received in high school and are going to look upon the junior college as another tracking system where they get shunted on to the lowest track. They are not going to be very tolerant of dead-end tracks or of those that fail to lead to the senior colleges.

It is an open question whether it takes a Black counselor to counsel a Black student or a Third World financial aid officer to handle the explosive issue of assistance to Third World students. Caucasian student personnel workers whose racial awareness is as white as their skins would be well advised to limit themselves to White students. Most student personnel staff members have basic understanding and empathy, but even these people will need to learn lots more about Third World students than can be got from reading Soul on Ice or Black Rage or from taking another sociology course or so. They will need to work with and for these ex-colonials in their communities and with and for them in their struggle on the campus.

This kind of involvement is not without its dangers, and not too many have a strong enough stomach for it. Those White professionals who are involved enough in mankind to respond to this challenge, may have to accept the rebuff of a self-imposed segregation and be tolerant of strident ethnocentrism during the transitional identity crisis. Interracial relations will remain up-tight and often irrational until the WASPs prove themselves worthy of trust and until the Third Worlders no longer feel compelled to shout, "I am me and I like what I see me to be!"

An example to develop the point: California's population is about 25 percent non-Caucasian, but something less than 5 percent of students in California institutions of higher learning are non-Caucasian. If racial equity were to be achieved tomorrow, as it almost has to be, old standards would simply have to be changed, dropped, circumvented. The logic must be faced that the same academic admission, retention, and graduation standards cannot be applied to students who have been singularly disadvantaged in academics, who have marched to the beat of a different drummer, who are rich in other dimensions of the human genius. The argument here is for multiple criteria, not for lower standards. The logic also has to be faced that during all those years of disadvantagement, Third World counselors, instructors, and other professionals were not being prepared, certainly not at a 25 percent rate. Now they are desperately needed, and some personnel selection standards are going to be bent and broken to get them in. The purist who sees all this as a lowering of the barriers, as a watering down of education, should have shown his concern long ago when gradualism was still an option. Again, this is not to say that the standards should be lower but that the criteria should be different, should be plural, should have latitude in interpretation. Besides, staff members who come in through the side door are likely to enter unencumbered with many of the hang-ups typical of those taking the orthodox path; en route they will have picked up some different forms of wisdom that will enrich the whole college community.

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

The community college student does not have much sense of community, on campus or off. There does not seem to be much of a "we" feeling among most junior college students, and there is, therefore, only faint loyalty to the college and even a more pallid identification with the wider community. In a study of junior college drop-outs, Jane Matson came to the conclusion that a lack of community feeling was one of the factors distinguishing between those who held on.[11]

Though junior colleges are often called community colleges, some question exists whether there is real community out there or only some businesses and some families who happen, geographically, to live next to each other. And on campus, for many, there is no little universe in which they find they can revolve. Part of the difficulty stems from the fact that students are usually commuters and often part-time workers. "For the usual student in a commuter college, his office, his file cabinet, his locker, sometimes his lunch room, and sometimes his trysting place, is his car. The reason for this is very simple: he has no home base on campus. The confused bedlam of the student center serves this need no better than the quiet hardchaired decorum of the library. The student is not likely to work out his problems of personality identity sitting in his car waiting for his next class. Neither is the college, nor the intellectual and cultural values for which it stands, likely to become the object of his identification.

One of the best ways to establish a "we" feeling is for "us" to do some significant things together. Projects in the outer community, wide work in some types of social service, discussion in small student-faculty retreats, participation in co-curricular activities of an active, non-spectator, type, involvement in sensitivity groups--all of these fall in the category of doing significant things together, and all fall within the scope of student personnel. Instead of relying only on the typical first semester orientation class, counselors might consider voluntary continuation of encounter or other types of group sessions for student exploration of the self and the significant other; these sessions would be open to the student for the duration of his enrollment in the community college.

As suggested before, the counseling function might be profitably decentralized and in the process become the hub of little universes to which the student could attach himself. There are any number of models for this: William Rainey Harper College in Illinois and Monterey Peninsula College in California are among those having decentralized counseling along divisional lines. De jure recognition of de facto clustering by color or ethnic origin might tie in neatly with current demands for separate Ethnic Studies. Even arbitrary clusters, as long as they allowed for mobility, might be worth a try.

AGE AND SEX

In age, students in junior colleges are more senior than students in senior colleges. Only 15 percent of entering four-year college students are over 19 years old, whereas over 30 percent of junior college freshmen have left their teens behind them. Actually, Leland Medsker reported almost 50 percent of junior college students had reached and passed their majority, but his data of the late 1950's may have been skewed to the high side by the veterans of the Korean War.[12] If all part-time students in the junior college evening divisions were included in the computation, the 50 percent figure would be a conservative estimate. An aggressive campaign by student personnel staffs to take vocational and educational counseling to the adults in their communities (now being done in some ghetto areas) would actually make those under 21 a minority in the junior colleges.

The implications of this age factor seem to have been largely ignored. Only a few junior colleges have counseling programs specially designed for older students, and many do not even have regular counseling services available for the thousands of adults in evening divisions. Older students returning to school after many years of absence have fears, aspirations and attitudes different from those of the recent high school graduate; they doubtless require a kind of orientation different from the stock "ease-them-out-of-puberty" introduction to college. They also need a different approach in counseling, one that recognizes their greater maturity, experience, and definitiveness of purpose and one that affords them not only respect but the dignity of being peers with the counselor.

Although some older students may want to merge completely with the younger students, most find themselves a little uncomfortable in any facilities outside the classroom and the library. Perhaps they deserve and would enjoy a special lounge within the student center, a retreat which would be quieter and less bouncy, where they could feel free to show their age. It is a rate junior college indeed which has any kind of organization for evening division students, and only the more aggressive adult students in the day divison involve themselves in student politics. These older students are often shining lights in the classroom but have little to say and, consequently, feel little involvement in the co-curricular program. This is unfortunate, for they would add richness to it and would gain richness from it. They are a large segment in a college system which claims to be student-centered. To be more or less blind to their presence in the total student personnel function is to negate a cardinal premise of the junior college philosophy.

No doubt there are other significant characteristics of junior college students that have implications for junior college student personnel programs. Even so, an end must be called at some point, and in this instance conclusion will be reached with brief mention of the factor of sex ratio. In studies done during the 1950's and reported by Leland Medsker, the ratio varied from three to one, to two to one, in favor of men over women.[12] This ratio, without question, reflects social values; education is highly valued for men and not so highly valued for women. Values can, of course, be taught, and if student personnel people believe that what is good for the gander is good for the goose, then it is encumbent upon them to try to recruit more girls among high school graduates and more women from the community. Beyond recruitment, counselors and other student personnel workers need to take a critical look at what the junior college has to offer women. If the curriculum is oriented towards male occupations, male interests, male predictions, then why should women enroll in number equal to the men's? The same goes for the co-curriculum. Too often the major role for girls in student activities is that of sex-symbol, which is rather limiting both as to numbers who qualify and as to scope. The budget, the nature of activities, the ease of involvement, and every aspect of the co-curricular program should be co-sexual, should reflect the fact that there are as many women as there are men and, more to the point, that as many women as men should be in college.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SUPPORTING REFERENCES

1. American College Testing Program. College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1966.

2. Astin, A.W., Panos, R.J. and Creager, J.A. "National Norm for Entering College Freshmen"--Fall, 1966. ACE Research Reports, Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.

3. Clark, Burton R. "The Cooling-out Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology 65: pp. 569-576; 1960.

4. Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

5. Collins, Charles C. College Orientation: Education for Relevance. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1969.

6. Collins, Charles C. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

7. Coordinating Council for Higher Education, "Fall 1968 Enrollment in California Higher Education." California Higher Education 3: p. 3; June, 1969.

8. Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

9. Goodman, Paul."The Present Moment in Education." The New York Review of Books, pp. 14-20, April 10, 1969.

10. Knoell, D.M. and Medsker, L.L. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

11. Matson, Jane E. Characteristics of Students Who Withdraw From A Public Junior College, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1955.

12. Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

13. Trent J.W. and Medsker, L.L. Beyond High School: A Study of 10,000 High School Graduates. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1967.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

DR. HITCHCOCK: This is really a devastating comment on the junior college. It seems to me that you are saying two-year colleges have failed in many significant ways and particularly in relation to the third world force and the third world schools. We have many evidences of this failure. Actually it is these colleges who should be in the forefront in this area, more, even, than the four-year colleges.

I would like to say a few words about your reference to the counselors. I do not know of the specific studies you cited about counselors in the two-year colleges; I do know, however, of fragmentary studies in secondary schools which show very clearly that counselors as a group are not intellectually oriented, are not aesthetically oriented, and that they are much more oriented toward the white middle class American culture of football, etc. This is all right in its way, but I think it ties in with your point about the intellectual content of the two-year college.

MR. KLEGMAN: Dr. Collins, you didn't make reference to the possibility that in selection of a terminal or transfer program, an individual might sense personal economic problems in going beyond two years, Because this individual student can't see himself lasting four years without some form of income, he settles for the terminal option.

DR. COLLINS: Undoubtedly it is a fact and a factor. I think my only rejoinder would be that we should not discourage students from preparing themselves for terminal education by which they can get a job at the end of two years. The program should be designed to be open-ended so, that, if that student five years from now wants to come back and upgrade himself and move on beyond those two years, he'll be able to. In most of the current terminal programs this is not possible.

MR. KLEGMAN: I don't know of any case at my institution where a student who applies has had his direction changed from an occupational area program to a transfer program, from, for example, an interest in technology to liberal arts. However, I do hear of applicants for liberal arts who are put into an occupational group. One of the weaknesses is our transfer programs are over-subscribed, and that is a tragedy.

PROF. HANSON: That has not been the case with us. We did an actual follow-up study of terminal students three or four years after they left us. We found that 75 percent transfer, which is higher than the figure in California; but also, I think part of our problem.

DR. COLLINS: Well, is that right? I don't know that it's opposed to California, and I have no reason to doubt what you say, but it is contrary to the community college experience throughout the United States.

PROF. HANSON: Well, I think part of the secret is following up over a longer period of time. Of course, it's taking what happens when they initially leave that makes a big difference in our figures too. If you wait and see what happens two years later, you find some of them are back in college, and you have no record of what happens after they leave.

MR. KLEGMAN: You mean those went into an occupation program?

PROF. HANSON: They worked for a couple of years and discovered they don't like the kind of work they're doing, and then discovered that they wanted to and could return.

MR. KLEGMAN: The counselor has a one-hour discussion at the time of admission and indicates to the student that the occupational program is oversubscribed. But the counselor find that the student eventually takes the occupational program and transfers as a junior.

DR. COLLINS: I have several responses to that. One is that it doesn't seem to me that what a person goes into ought to be based on whether a college is oversubscribed or not. The other thing is I wonder what kind of occupational programs do we have that are so lacking in intellectual rigor that a student could get through those and not be able to get through some of the programs which at a later point he might elect.

MR. KLEGMAN: I agree. In New York, it is my understanding that you can transfer without question to a four-year school total credits with a A.A. degree, but, if you have an A.A.S., then it's course by course evaluation.

It looks as though here in New York State there isn't a guarantee. In New Jersey, we have the assurance that every one of our associate in art degree students can enter a state university with total credit. An A.A.S. student, well how can we possibly translate courses in secretarial science, for example, to the value of first and second year programs?

DR. COLLINS: Yes. This is what I meant by using the power of number in the community colleges to make the university begin to think about its curriculum a little bit more. Although we don't have many programs such as this, let's say by way of an example, that a student went through a carpentry course or program. There is such an occupation as building contractor, and it might be possible for a state college to set up a program to take people who have gone through a carpentry program in a community college, and who have been out working for five years, who wish to move into building contractor preparation. This could be done with almost any occupation by simply redesigning the curriculum, into a kind of spiral.

DR. FARRIS: I was just curious about your statement that most of the two-year college students are from the lower socio-economic background . Is that true in California and all over, or are my views of middle class-lower class so wrong? My experience indicates that they come largely from just the middle class.

DR. COLLINS: I would say that until the last half of this last decade, students in two-year colleges certainly did come from the lower middle class and the upper middle class. If you will allow me to use a kind of sociological step ladder, there are many students coming from the upper-lower class with at least a sprinkling from the lower group, and that is true not just for California.

Now, it may be different in your particular state. Certainly it would be different in states with a tuitional system in their community colleges without any kind of financial aid. Many states do have tuitional systems, but they have a financial aid program going that will compensate for it.

PROF. ALDINGTON: I want to tie back to Mr. Klegman's comments. In Mohawk Valley, we're experiencing a new trend that's been repeated and reinforced the last few years. This trend is that students who do not have a strong commitment in terms of what they want to do, usualy do not choose technology or career programs. If they do, they choose them reluctantly.

As a result, our liberal arts department is overloaded, and one of our big concerns is whether or not to cut the strings on the growth of the liberal arts department. This is necessary when the notion, even for students coming in, is to drop out of a program where commitment is required in order to succeed, and, therefore, the liberal arts professors are having a difficult time building commitment within their program.

DR. COLLINS: What you would do, in other words, would be to reduce the students' options. What about an alternative option? What about development of a core curriculum by which the student could simply make a choice towards a very large job area, like say physical science technologies or the general science services, and also have a core cirriculum which allows the student to move along any number of avenues away from the hub kind of curriculum? We did this at Claremont College. During their first year, we had the students take the core curriculum. Those committed enough, to really know what they wanted, might take one or two specialty courses during that first year. Then, within the second year, there would be a great concentration of the specialty courses.

MR. KLEGMAN: Do you have vocational high schools in your state?

DR. COLLINS: No, because more and more of that function has been taken over by the community colleges. I shouldn't say no categorically, but they're not very important.

DR. WOLFBEIN: This idea is more than the core curriculum. What you're really saying is that you have to do something somewhere along the line just like we do in academia. In order to be an M.D. let's say, you have a sequence. You have various ports of entry, and you have various ports where you exit.

Now, in a place like New Haven, you can opt to go into the health career program when you're in the ninth grade. Some people will fall out in the tenth grade and become ward attendants. However, they may come back after a year, with no penalty, and go on. Some people go on, let's say graduate with a high school diploma and go into a different kind of occupation. That doesn't mean that a year later they can't go into the community college or the college and start going on the track for possibly an R.N. at Yale. Yale University has put in writing, that they're willing to move to the point where they'll take on an M.D. So, it can be done, and it is being done.

However, I really don't see much success for suggestions at the community college level unless we are able to make some difference, counseling, etc., at the high school level because that's where the trauma occurs. I won't take up your time, but somewhere along the line we ought to up to that. We need an answer to the following question which I don't ask you to respond to now, but I think we'd be obfucating this assembly if we didn't ask. It goes as follows:

In most of the high schools, we have free access--as a matter of fact, I think a student is required to be in high school until he is sixteen years old; otherwise he wears all sorts of invidious labels like truant and so on. As a matter of fact, in even a place like Philadelphia, one can't defect. Anybody who wants a high school diploma can get one; no problem except that it's derogated the high school diploma, so now the community college people are assuming this job. We need a confronting kind of answer to the query, how do you have free access and be free of testing. We're all saying the same words: How do you do that and still move to a point where, however, you define the standards, you achieve them. When the answer to that one is found, then we will have taken a quantum jump forward.

PROF. HANSON: And the facilitation of that lies in just what you said; with the first educational opportunity many of these kids have ever had. The first place we can give them freedom, is the community college.

DR. WOLFBEIN: Are you saying really compensatory education?

DR. COLLINS: No, you're saying the opportunity to move ahead on their own is there. We must stop treating them like testing stations and stop leading their lives for them. I don't know how it happened with you, but it happend with me in the secondary school; I got freedom. We can give that freedom in the community college.

DR. WOLFBEIN: What have you got against the high school; why can't you do it in the high school?

DR. COLLINS: Because the law is against us. They have to be there; we have a prison population.

STUDENT: Can I just extend your argument further, I think this casting the blame on the high schools or on the elementary schools is one of the things we really do in higher education. Let's face it; education has been one of the most inflexible, uninnovative institutions in this country. Society says why aren't the high schools or the elementary schools innovating? It's a logical question, but at the community college level you can't do anything except set an example so, I think, what you've got to start doing is taking a look at your programs instead of saying when a student enters, "Make a choice." You've got kids going through four-year institutions and graduate schools who by the time they are out of graduate school, haven't made a choice, but, we tell students the first year they come to a community college, "choose now, baby."

MR. KLEGMAN: If I may go back, I have talked about counseling in high school. This is the weakness and I have to go back to industry or my own business experience. We have a large computer and the computer does everything. If the input is bad, nothing is ground out. If we do grind it out, it's worthless. When we find this problem; and we have input from thousands of sources, we go to the source of input and correct it. If the high schools can't do it there, they should let us develop the counseling or guidance program in the high schools because this is where the input comes from. Let's get the input the way it should be. It can be changed, the law notwithstanding. Laws can be changed.

DR. FARRIS: I want to say one thing and that is that it's not safe to assume that one person can possibly speak for black people or brown people. The problem is that people are looking at us so long and thinking we all look alike and end up thinking we all think alike. That's not true. There are many factions in black people just as there are in white people or any other people, so that when a person says, "I don't want this, or I want this, for the black people," they're expressing their opinion. We have our silent majority who are very hard and pigheaded, too. But that I can let pass because I'm sure you already know that. It's just a reminder of being careful.

In keeping with your transfer student orientation toward human action and human relations, and because, I feel, so much of the way our society is structured technologically away from individualization of man's need and lack of concern for his fellow man, I think it would be very advantageous for two-year colleges to offer a two-year program which would include courses, as well as a possible internship, on subcultures in community settings. These courses would take in all the so-called groups; the WASP subculture as well as the blacks, and Puerto Ricans. The program should be open to high school post graduates and post Ph.D.'s or M.D.'s. Also this would include high school and elementary school teachers who at present do not know how to work with children of a different subculture. However, many teachers are so desperate for jobs they will take any job and run the risk of ruining certain students' minds because they are not able to work with them. Also this is true of the doctor, or the sanitation expert, who could then use his specific training to go in and adapt it for this subcultured living.

DR. COLLINS: You know, Professor Hitton is doing that now. Merritt College in Oakland has such a program with transferability because their students choose to move on particularly to the State College. At the moment San Francisco State has a similar upper-division program.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND THE 'DISADVANTAGED' STUDENT

Vera K. Farris

Dr. Farris, now assistant to the Academic Vice-President at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, serves also as chairman of the Faculty Senate Commission of Expanding Educational Opportunity, She received her B.S. degree from Tuskegee Institute, and her M.A. and Ph.D. in Biology from the University of Massachusetts. Dr. Farris taught at the University of Michigan before coming to Stony Brook in 1968.

Today is a period of flux and transition. During such an era it seems neither timely nor wise to be an "expert," hence I have divided this paper into two parts--1) Observations of some of the problems of "disadvantaged" students in the community colleges, and 2) Suggestions of methods to alleviate the problematic situations.

The first observation concerns the word "disadvantaged." Present day usage has resulted in this word having negative connotations to many of the students to which it is applied. Better terms, such as culturally distinct, exceptional, or extraordinary could be suggested; however, it is apparent that any appellation would soon become a stigma, and, therefore, I suggest that "prefacing" terms be deleted altogether for students once they have been admitted and are entering the community college system.

A second observation concerns the increasingly crucial role of the community college system in the State of New York as it relates to people who previously would not have had the opportunity to go to college. Governor Rockefeller's address as printed in the New York Times (January 8, 1970) stated that in the "Full Opportunity" program there will be "access to a meaningful further education for every young man and woman graduating from high school in New York State." Elements of the program include "An increase in State operating aid for community colleges from 33 and one-third percent to 40 percent for those community colleges submitting acceptable plans for admission of all high school graduates in their area who apply" and "Expansion of State University urban centers to provide occupational education for additional urban citizens." Hence, it seems necessary for the community colleges and their associated centers to be prepared to educate the diverse students who now will be potential enrollees.

Historically, prior to 1966 few community colleges had more than a token group of Black or Puerto Rican students from economically or academically deficient backgrounds. However, once educational opportunity programs were established such students began to enter the community colleges in somewhat larger numbers for the first time. Today, even though the number of students from disadvantaged backgrounds in the entire State University of New York is still small, i.e. approximately 2,700 students compared to approximately 186,000 full-time regular students, the problems associated with students from culturally distinct backgrounds sometimes appear large. The reasons for the problems appearing large are varied. One major reason, however, is that consciously or subconsciously academic policies are designed for the majority population of the institution.

There are few schools whose policies allow for language arts skills, tutoring, developmental courses, and new curriculums designed to provide a relevant education for students from cultural minorities. Hence, in 1970, one finds the community colleges attempting to add special programs, making changes in the curricular material, and adapting small segments of the college for the "new" type of students entering its system. Hopefully, they will not try to build brick houses on bamboo shoot foundations, but will make realistic changes to provide meaningful education for all students seeking their programs.

The third observation deals with the students themselves. Mainly I will be discussing Black and Puerto Rican students since they constitute a large number of the academically and economically deficient students entering college at this time, and since I myself am a Black person. By "Black" I refer to all students previously referred to as Negro, West Indian, Afro-American or Black and by "Puerto Rican" I refer to students from Latin American groups of Spanish-speaking origins.

Hitherto, most students going to community colleges were from middle class American homes, and as a consequence of their college traning, were turned into skilled, educated, middle or upper class individuals ready to begin the cycle all over again. These students really have never had to make the decision of going to college. It was made for them from early childhood through high school by parents, mass media, guidance counselors, interested teachers, neighbors, college-educated people in the community, etc. It almost seems to seep in at birth, and be reinforced daily that a person had better have some post high school training to stay in the solid middle class.

Most Black or Puerto Rican children are not exposed to situations like the ones described above. Few, if any periodicals are in his house. Few have college-graduate neighbors. Few people in the elementary, junior, or senior high schools advise Black children of the advantages or opportunities which only advanced education provides in our technology-oriented society. Vocational training is often suggested, but up to recently, it has not been the type for which community colleges are so well known. Community colleges prepare individuals to be competent in areas such as highly skilled craftsmen, high-grade technicians, engineers, and businessmen. These are levels on which Black and Puerto Rican people have been noticeably few (e.g. see Long Island Press, Business Blacks In Supply?, March 7, 1970.) Hence "vocational" training for Black people has meant construction work, unskilled labor, or at best, assistants to the men and women who have been trained in community colleges over the last decades. A Government Report[1] in February, 1970 shows that in 1968 only 19 percent of persons 18-24 years old were not enrolled in school and were not high school graduates. However, when these figures are disaggregated by race, it can be seen that whereas 17 percent of the whites are in the dropout category, 32 percent of the Afro-American and other races are in this category. Further, persons residing within poverty areas, whether White or

---

[1] Characteristics of American Youth, p. 23, No. 30, February 6, 1970 U.S. Department of Commerce Publication--U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Black are more likely to be dropouts than persons living in other poverty areas. Thus, it is not difficult to see one critical factor that causes a difference between the student now entering college and those that have been "regular residents" for years. One student comes from a home where the family has been living mainly for its child to grow up, choose a school, and go to college. The other student, who has no less potential, has been stifled simply because he grew up in different circumstances. One result is that the latter student was much later in coming to the decision that he could go to post-high school training. In many cases he does not know until scant weeks prior to being a student that he will be enrolled in college at all. Therefore, it is not surprising that the average incoming student in college is 17 years old, while the average student from an economically and academically disadvantaged background is closer to 21. All of these factors are significant in understanding the differences between students presently entering halls of higher learning.

The differences of the students is emphasized further once he enters the community college. The general philosophy of the college is "we are giving you an opportunity, now take advantage of it" i.e. do or die.

I hope the previous statements have given some insight into how unrealistic such an attitude is toward the student who has not spent 12 years preparing for college. The lack of realism in such an attitude cannot be emphasized too strongly when it is considered that this student of whom we are speaking is faced with a new, and in many cases hostile and inhospitable environment simply upon entering college. It is significant that the Bureau of the Census (March, 1970) shows the number of Black students in college in 1968 was an 85 percent increase over the number enrolled in 1964. Prior to that period the Black students in colleges were enrolled mainly in the traditionally Black colleges and universities. Hence, the recent increase must be due largely to Black and Puerto Rican students now entering predominantly white colleges and universities also. Thus, many students enrolled in community colleges via the educational opportunity program for the first time report that often there are no persons available from whom they can obtain the answer to specific questions pertinent to their needs and likes, such as where one can obtain haircuts, specific kinds of music, books, food, etc. It should be noted at this point, that some of the community colleges have acquired quite a reputation for "provincial attitudes." The role of the academic and administrative majority policies can be seen readily under these circumstances.

As the student moves on to start classwork, his problems are increased in both degree and kind. He soon learns that he is expected to know what the college has to offer, and what is demanded of him in each class, although he may not have heard even the course titles prior to entering school--Oleroculture? D.C. Theory and Lab I? Dimensioning? Orthographic Projection I? Further, in many cases where the title of the course is familiar, the content is different from his expectations or from the content of his comparable high school course.

An example of this is present day college biology. Any student entering the couse thinking of structural whole plant or whole animal biology would be at a disadvantage. Most modern biology courses emphasize conceptual biology employing cells, molecules and biochemistry. The student from middle class homes whose parents have periodicals like Look, Life, or Time probably is aware of DNA, RNA and Proteins, which make up the molecular basis of biology, but few homes of students from economically deficient backgrounds can afford to spend money on periodicals.

In class the student from an academically deficient background soon finds out that he has difficulties right from the start. However, most of the other students, mainly from middle class backgrounds, do not appear to have these difficulties. The reason for this appears to be due largely to a single fact. Most teachers when giving a new or difficult concept will employ a "familiar" example to explain it. The teacher comes from a middle class background, hence, uses an example common to his (and the middle class students') experience. But the Black or Puerto Rican student often comes from a different background and experience, and find himself trying to relate to a new concept and also a new and unfamiliar example. Thus, the students cry "irrelevant" about much of the material being presented in colleges and universities today. An example of this situation can be shown with Introductory Biology. The teacher introduces a modern concept of genetics the study of heredity, employing modifier and intensifier genes. For an example he use the length of Drosophila (the fruit fly) wings. The same principle of intensifier and modifier genes applies to skin color of humans and could be used as the example of the concept. There is no questiong but that human skin color would be more relevant and interesting to all students in the class regardless of their background. Further, nearly all students have noticed skin color, and are familiar with it.

The general teaching policies of today as described above tend to reinforce a very ugly situation operating in the whole educational system, i.e. the perpetuation of the very kind of racism that most institutions say they are trying to terminate. It embodies the white superiority myth where the white student does well, looks intelligent via asking questions and "rapid comprehension" of the concept and example and finally goes on to "achieve" in a blaze of glory, while many of the students from academically and economically deficient backgrounds become frustrated and "cop out" by refusing to attend classes or in a few extreme cases drop out altogether. Thus, this student with potential, eagerness, excitement and interest in higher learning soon begins to have self-doubts, uncertainty and bitterness. Such students feel that not only was the system for educating him designed to fail, but worse, the student himself is expected to fail.

A final example of how ugly this situation is can be pointed out by the cases, fortunately small in number, where teachers give passing grades to Black and Puerto Rican students who have poor attendance records, no assignments fulfilled and failing grades on the assumption that "those poor students can't do any better." The truth of course is that with a meaningful program and help by the faculty to bridge the students academic deficiencies and his expectations of college, he could develop and realize his potential to become a totally functional student. Thus, the attitudes of some faculty members leave much to be desired. Consciously or subconsciously, the resentment about "more work" and "more difficulties" has led to these students being treated as second-class citizens on some campuses.

My final observations are concerned with major problems encountered at community colleges and urban centers as reported specifically to me by the students involved. Students appear to be mainly concerned about a) the lack of job assurance if one does finish school, b) the lack of assurance that one may proceed to a four-year college if one's work merits it, and c) the inability to move easily between urban centers, community colleges, and four-year colleges. As related to c), the transfer of credits between the schools appears to lack uniformity and is totally confusing to the students, and further, the difficulty in transferring funds, awards, etc. between colleges if one desires to change his major or specialization is very problematic.

Further, many of the residential community colleges are great distances from a Black or Puerto Rican community, hence, there are no ties at all for this student with his cultural interest, and often too little money to visit home on a regular basis to see "what's happening" in the real world.

The concern voiced most often by students from the commuter colleges is that they do not have a real opportunity for exchanging ideas, discussion of mutual problems, or general fellowship with other persons, who are undergoing experiences similar to their own. Hence, there is a feeling that they have not upgraded their full development or been aided in the making of a "whole person."

The second part of the paper will be concerned with a few suggestions for means whereby community colleges and their associated centers can move to alleviate the problematic situations that have been observed, and to provide a meaningful education to the students who have entered school with economically and academically deficient backgrounds.

In general, there are four major areas which will be covered. They are:

1) Funding of the student
2) Academic programs including curriculum development and modification
3) Administrative policy
4) Evaluation of progress of the programs

I Funding

It seems essential that students from economically deficient backgrounds be funded adequately if the student is to be encouraged to enter, endure, and succeed in the community college or the urban center. The following outline is a suggested flexline (flexible guideline = flexline).

Funding of the Student

1) Provide funding in such a manner that a student entering the urban center or the community college with a financially defienct background can be assured that, if he demonstrates the aptitude and the desire, he will
    a) be funded to complete the entire program in which he is enrolled and obtain a degree, certificate or diploma respectively, i.e. the money will be provided for a six-month or a two-year program if he wishes to be a stenographer or automotive technologist respectively.

2) For residential colleges, provide individual funding to the extent that the student will be able to have a campus life similar to that of any other student, i.e. room, board, tuition, medical, dental, and book expense money should be provided. The students should also have a stipend for personal expenses.

3) For communter colleges and urban center, provide adequate funding so that "potential" students seeking to upgrade themselves through pre-college programs or study skills can avail themselves of the opportunity.

4) Discourage students with economically deficient backgrounds from making loans to fund their education as this tend to lead to:
    a) anxieties about the amount of time spent in school, a job, and "starting out in life owing money."
    b) forces the student to seek a job simply for high wages instead of one that might be in his community but pays less.

No doubt a large portion of the money needed for funding the students will be obtained from the educational opportunities programs. The college or center should contribute also to the funding, especially in the form of scholarships or awards to advanced students who have made special efforts, shown good organization, creative efforts, etc. The added incentive might make the student feel more closely identified with the school and less stigmatized for having started out with academic deficiencies in his background.

II Suggestions for Academic Programs and Curricular Modifications for the Students

Admission

1) Each institution should have a special admissions committee established solely for the admission of academically and economically deficient students.
    a) The special admissions committee should consist of administrators, faculty, students, and rotating community representatives.
        (1) All members of the committee should be from the same ethnic origin of the prospective students or have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the background and culture of such students.
    b) The special committee should work closely with the local educational opportunity program but should have the final voice in admission.

2) Each prospective student should be interviewed personally before admission.
    a) At the time of the interview, knowledgeable persons familiar with the students' cultural and ethnic origin should be present to answer freely and honestly, pertinent questions from the student.

b) During the interview period, every effort should be made to inform the student of the general types of instructional programs offered at the institution andthe possible job consequences resulting from each of the programs. He should be informed also about the financial aid possibilities as well as the social atmosphere he can expect.

The admission of students to school is always a critical factor. It seems imperative, at this time particularly, that people ethnically similar to those to be admitted become involved in admissions. The rationale for this is twofold. First, by nature of their similar background and common experiences Black and Puerto Rican people are better prepared than anyone else to evaluate which other Black and Puerto Rican people should be students in urban centers and community colleges. Second, the motives whereby they make the decisions about admission for students are usually not modified by fear, guilt, thoughts of compensation, racism, or emotionalism that sometimes become the yardstick when well-intentioned, but culturally dissimilar, people make the selections.

Orientation

The suggestion for orientation for the students under discussion has two segments. The first part deals with methods of bridging the gap between the students' expectations and those of the college, while the second aspect is concerned with a program for faculty and staff who will be working with these students.

Orientation Programs for Students

1) Each local institution should provide a special, extended orientation program for all students from economically and academically deficient backgrounds entering the school for the first time. Such students should be funded for transportation, room and board, and personal expenses while participating in the orientation.

2) Such a program should include:
   a) Specially designed, rigorous, innovative, developmental courses in the basic academic and manual skills.
   b) Academic advisement.
   c) Counseling (personal and professional).
   d) Ongoing seminars and "rap" sessions between new students and those already enrolled in the school.
   e) Assistance and time enough for the student to acclimate to the institution's environment and "atmosphere."

3) Whenever possible the faculty and staff employed in the special orientation should be selected from the local institution. Further, the faculty and staff should be rotated periodically so that the greatest number possible are exposed to the students. Such faculty and staff should be compensated fully, at the local campus norm for such service.
   a) Whenever possible students of similar background already enrolled in the program should be employed as teaching assistants and student counselors since this will reinforce their academic proficiency as well as permit the new students to see persons like themselves who are in the process of obtaining a degree or certificate.

4) The staff involved in supportive services from the local educational opportunity program should work closely with the orientation program so that the enthusiasm, and confidence built up in the student by orientation can be continued on a year-round basis.

5) Parents or relatives should be encouraged to visit the student at the institution at least once during the orientation. Funding should be provided for this if necessary. It seems essential to me that the student keep in contact with his family and community so that going to post-high school training does not mean an automatic major gap between the student and his community and family.

Orientation for Faculty and Staff

The community colleges should unite and collectively sponsor one or more workshops or institutes annually, concerned specifically with working with students from economically and academically deficient backgrounds on the r professional levels such as teaching, counseling, tutoring, etc.

1) The annual institutes and workshops should include both students and community representatives of the ethnic origin of the students with whom the professional people will be working. The contributing students and community representatives should be compensated for sharing their knowledge and expertise with the conference participants.

2) Workshops, institutes and scholarships should be initiated to generate research, proposals for new courses, and curricular material to benefit culturally distinct students.

The rationale for these suggestions is twofold.

1) The students entering college are predominantly in their late teens or early twenties. This age group is particularly sensitive to adult observation (staring) and questioning i.e. well-meaning persons asking questions such as "What is it like to be Black?" "Don't all Puerto Ricans carry knives?" "What is it like to live in a ghetto?" "I thought all you people use drugs?" The students should not be required to act in the role of a walking education for the faculty, other students, and staff at any school. Hopefully institutes and workshops can deal with these problems.

2) Teachers as well as others should be able to broaden their experiences through the workshops sufficiently to find more relevant and interesting examples to use to complement conceptual learning.

Curriculum

Suggestions for Curriculum Development and Modification

The involvement of faculty with the exceptional student is vital to his success. Indeed, the expertise, talent, and experience of the faculty is the greatest single element in the success of the academically deficient student.

Recommendations for Faculty Involvement in Curriculum Development and Modification

1) Each institution should develop an interdepartmental council which includes the following:
   a) One or more faculty members from each department offering introductory courses.
   b) Student representatives from culturally distinct backgrounds (some newly enrolled, some more advanced.)
   c) The director and selected representatives from the local educational opportunity program.

   The function of such a committee would be to deal with course, curriculum, and other educational concerns of the students.

2) Each institution should encourage faculty to use their skills and expertise to develop new courses to meet the special needs of the students, or innovate ways of teaching regular courses which more nearly accommodate to the needs of the students.
   a) Such faculty should be given released time or summer research fellowships to work on ideas, proposals, etc.
   b) Faculty members' contributions to the needs of the disadvantaged should be considered in recommendations regarding tenure and promotion, interpreting such activities within various of the five evaluation criteria:
      1) Mastery of subject matter
      2) Effectiveness in teaching
      3) Scholarly ability
      4) Effectiveness of university service
      5) Continuing growth

   To aid in the implementation of this recommendation the University-Wide Faculty Senate, on February 6, 1970, passed the following two resolutions.

   1) Be it resolved that the University:
      a) Set aside an amount of money equal to that required to support five Conversations in the Disciplines and to allocate this sum for the support of one or more workshops or institutes dealing with course and curriculum materials which support the Expanding Educational Opportunity Programs; and
      b) Petition the Research Foundation to set aside a substantial sum to support a special genre of proposals dealing with innovations in teaching, curriculum and courses which are connected to EEO programs.
   2) Be it resolved that Central Administration urge all campus presidents to instruct those committees or individuals making recommendations regarding tenure and promotion to consider a faculty member's contribution to an activity in the campuses' Expanding Educational Opportunities program, interpreting such activities withing various of the five (5) evaluation criteria.

Curriculum Modification

1) Each institute should plan to implement as soon as possible the coloring or "blackening" of all their existing curriculum. This aspect is essential if a meaningful education of people in this country is to be accomplished.

2) Guest lecturers from culturally distinct communities with expertise in areas other than "traditional" education should be invited for lecture series or courses.

3) Ongoing seminars on adaptation of the schools' educational resources to a variety of different types of community's needs should be included in the regular curriculum.

Curriculum Development (Especially for the Community Colleges)

The needs of today's students, especially the Black and Puerto Rican students, could be served greatly by some change in the existing two-year college curriculum. Throughout this country there is a need for Black and Puerto Rican counselors, teachers (especially in Afro-American and Latin-American studies programs) businessmen, administrators, program leaders, etc. Although many schools now have programs designed to help students from disadvantaged backgrounds there are still too few to fill the gaps that lie between America yesterday and today.

Recently an article written by Dr. S.F. Walton, Jr. was published where he suggested that an Associate of Arts (AA) degree with teaching credentials be given in Afro-American studies (or other ethnic minority studies) and that persons holding such a degree be allowed to teach in all schools where a credential is required. He suggests that these teachers be employed as follows:

1) Work two hours a day, with only one hour in the classroom, the other used for preparation and in-service training.
2) Require that they be enrolled for at least twelve quarter hours in an accredited college or university to pursue the A.B. degree.
3) Require them to maintain at least a C average on a cumulative basis in order to be considered for reemployment the following term.
4) Provide them prorated district fringe benefits.

The merits of such a plan expanded over a number of educational disciplines are obvious. The educational wealth is also clear since:
1) The number of persons available to be employed in existing programs at local institutions and in other jobs would be rapidly increased.
2) Such persons could pay their own fees from their earnings, hence this would increase the number of students from economically deficient homes who could obtain an education. The value of the student at the University would overcome the difficulty encountered at present of getting advanced students into four-year colleges.
3) The time spent in in-service training would be both meaningful and useful.

A second type of de novo curriculum possible for the community colleges centers around a degree or certificate in subcultural studies that would be open to post bachelor, post master, and post doctoral people as well as high school graduates. The purpose of this program would be to provide the background to enable a person to apply his skills to community work regardless of his level of formal training or the discipline in which he was trained.

Suggestions for the Urban Centers in New York

The urban centers have a unique position, hence a few suggestions especially for their situation seem necessary.

1) Urban centers should maintain maximum flexibility in course offerings to prevent producing too many people in similar jobs when upgrading their students.
2) Urban centers should utilize, in their curriculum, "nuclear" courses which will provide the basis for many types of jobs and have the students "specialize" only at or near the end of the training period. For example, the centers could plan and conduct a basic six-week course called Technology. At the end of the six-week period the student could choose a special area in which he wishes to major or emphasize. The time required to adapt the technology course to a specific area would take about two weeks extra. Thus he could elect to become anyone of the following:
    1) Air pollution technician
    2) X-ray technician assistant
    3) Practical nurse
    4) Photographer's assistant
    5) Marine biology assistant
    6) Urban health technician
    7) Water pollution technician
    8) Laboratory assistant

The benefits of a "nuclear" course approach are a) if one type of job gets "phased out" by automation, etc. he can learn a new area in the two-week time period required to adapt his knowledge of technology, b) the enrollee in technology has a number of choices from which he can select after he finishes the course, i.e. if he enrolled to be an air pollution technician and did not like it he could change easily and rapidly to another speciality and c) enrollees could be trained for industry, hospitals, or corporations with very little difficulty. The company would hire them after the six-week basic course and provide the last two-week training period themselves.

3) Centers might find it fruitful to maintain an ongoing relationship with hospitals, schools, industry, business, and corporations to determine in which areas they need people trained. Perhaps industry could "loan" or "trade" staff and equipment for rapid training in exchange for "internships" etc.

4) Local institutions should provide some job security for the center's director, faculty, and staff by building in possibilities for promotion and tenure.

III Administrative Policies

The following are suggestions for modification of administrative policies.

Academic and Administrative Policy Modifications

1) Each institution should have a standing committee to act in an advisory and planning capacity for the students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

   Such a committee should be composed of:

   1) The director of the local Expanding Educational Opportunities Program
   2) Students
      a) Representatives of the local Expanding Educational Opportunities Program
      b) Representatives of Student Government or student body
   3) Administration
      a) The Chief Officer of the Office of Administrative Affairs or his designee.
      b) The Chief Officer of the Office of Academic Affairs or his designee.
      c) The Chief Officer of the Office of Student Affairs or his designee.
   4) Faculty
      a) Instructional
      b) Non-Instructional
   5) Community

      Community representation should include:

      1. Minority group members
      2. Business group representatives
      3. Professional service organizations
      4. Alumni
      5. Others as appropriate

Periodic rotation of the members of the advisory committee is recommended

The selection process should be established by the director of the local Expanding Educational Opportunities program in consultation with the Chief Administration Office of the local campus.

2) Each institution should establish a permanent recruitment office that has contacts with the "third world" and grass roots organizations as well as the more traditional routes.

3) Each institution should have at least a director, counselors, and specialized professional staff associated exclusively with culturally distinct students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

4) Each institution should have an advisor for extra campus affairs of Community Ombudsman. His function would be to tie the student in with the closest community which is similar to his indigenous one, and help the student keep in touch with the real world.

Policy

Most of the Black people in college today are young and forward looking with new concepts and ideas of their own, hence I suggest that in keeping with their concepts, all students biologically and recognizably so should be called Black or Afro-Americans in classrooms, social events, textbooks, etc. Further, administrative policy should recognize that there is a difference between the word militant and the word violence. The present usage of the word militant when applied by minority groups usually indicates a political position. On the other hand the word violence means a physical act. The two words are not synonymous, and hence my other suggestions would be:

1) To stop penalizing the militant Black and Puerto Rican students.

2) To stop trying to stifle their anger

Their militant position as well as their anger is very functional in light of today's needs, i.e. the need to have a positive position with which to identify, and sufficient energy and focus to maintain that identity.

The need for social interaction should not be overlooked or considered unimportant. Some suggestions for alleviating social needs are:

1) Each local campus should have a lounge or space designated predominantly for students from each culturally distinct group. This lounge should be provided with a phonograph, records, tapes, and other forms of social artifacts pertinent to the particular background. It would be helpful to give the students a budget for inviting guest speakers to the room and for decoration and upkeep of the room.

2) In outlying areas campuses should provide transportation at least once a month to the nearest large community of people similar in ethnic origin to the particular culture of the students.

3) Sponsor periodic Cultural-oriented Weekends, Festivals and Experiences inviting relatives, community people, and students of the same ethnic origin from other campuses.

Two other areas with which the community colleges should be concerned are research and evaluation as relates to their impact on students from academically and economically deficient backgrounds and vice versa. Certainly, each institution should allow for and submit to evaluation of the needs of culturally distinct students periodically. This evaluation should be made: a) by the students according to criteria they themselves establish; b) by the faculty and staff using data accumulated by them and relating to student success and progress; c) by the advisory committee according to the designated aims of the programs in which the students are involved and their impact on the campus and community; and d) independent assessment groups. Also it would be valuable to determine the impact of the students graduating from the community colleges and urban centers on society, community, education, social services, etc.

Earlier, I mentioned that the words exceptional or extraordinary were better terms to apply to the students from "disadvantaged" backgrounds. Indeed, these students are exceptional since it is through them that the colleges and universities of today can be involved in fresh approaches and meaningful changes in education.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

MR. ROBBINS: I'd like to comment on a possible misunderstanding about the opportunity for blacks in the community colleges. It seems to me that your last comment suggested that the two-year college can really be a place where we, folliwing a number of the innovative ideas you have, can do a lot with the blacks. That is, of course, if we choose to do it. However, at the beginning of your remarks today you said that the two-year college may not be the place for them. Would you react to this?

DR. FARRIS: I think it is very healthy to have both programs that go right out into the community for the student who so wishes and can cope with them, and programs away from the student's locale. If the student is away from his environment and can use his time to concentrate fully, he gets a chance to be involved with more than just the course work. Because he has to deal with influences of other students living around him, he becomes a different and whole person. He has to deal with the fact of living away from home, and he has to work within a different environment, which I think is very good.

Our students have had very little exposure, some of them who are really tied in with the movement, would elect to stay there and they should do so. But some need to get away from emotional involvement, to get at this different environment. Therefore, I think, you have to offer both. I don't think there is a one-shot answer that if we move into the communities, every purpose will be served, or if we stay on the campus, every purpose will be served. I think you need both. One of the complaints that some students make is that "I can't really work effectively on my materials at home because I have fourteen sisters or brothers, and it's hard for my family to understand what I'm trying to do." The family still thinks that he ought to do this and this and this plus trying to study this and this and this. There are all kinds of surrounding problems.

DR. COLLINS: I'd like to raise a question of learning styles. You indicated that most of us white people, given our background, would not survive very long in Harlem without--

DR. FARRIS: --Special training

DR. COLLINS: --some way or other coming to a special kind of training. This implies that the people who lived in Harlem do learn in a special kind of way.

DR. FARRIS: Absolutely.

DR. COLLINS: Do you have any recommendations on learning styles which the community colleges could use that might be more appropriate to the blacks or to the Chicanos or the varying groups coming in to colleges.

As you know, there are many, many people who are basically illiterate, that is to say, cannot read or write, but they're a long way from being ignorant or ill-informed, they simply have learned in other styles. They have learned in their ears perhaps rather than through their eyes. This sets me thinking. Have we in our sort of tunnel vision looked upon reading, this kind of linear type of learning, as the only method by which learning can take place when there really are other methods by which learning can take place?

DR. FARRIS: I can't help but agree with you wholeheartedly on this. One of the things which has always struck me, is the irony of persons who will say things in front of people who are not educated because they feel they will not understand and, of course, they do. They're very sensitive to them. Learning style is critical. I make a point at the beginning of every year of translating certain kinds of materials I'm going to teach into what I call non-standard English and dialect because I know it will reach the student. I start out immediately with their vocabulary to show I recognize their innate knowledge. They've got innate knowledge, and from this I like to start. I begin with this and, invariably they end up learning the material in standard English as well as in their own way. There is a translation process at first, but then it's a very real and very relevant experience for them. They can switch back and forth. They end up going home being able to explain to their parents what they had. That is very important.

DR. COLLINS: And your basic assumption then is that the individual adapts himself to say the language?

DR. FARRIS: I think he reacts as any other person who is bilingual. He can swing back and forth. Quite frankly, the way I got the idea was last year I had a number of Oriental students in my class. I felt a kind of parallelism between he kinds of problems both groups had.

MR. REAVIS: Wouldn't it be safe to say that the community colleges have been accused appropriately of not even working with the white disadvantaged students in their given setting? To a great degree, this meant that irrespective of a peron's color, if he were disadvantaged, one of the places he sbuldn't be, would be in a community college. This was tre because of the format they used in order to administer their type of of program.

DR. FARRIS: But the major difference still remains that when the disadvantaged white students get their A.A.S., they can go out and get jobs very easily.

MR. GRAY: When you were talking about orientation programs and this type of thing for students, you indicated an extended program. Could we pursue that and see what kind of extension is involved? I'm concerned here with what kind of a phase-in, phase-out do you go through? In other words, do you take him by the hand for the first year and then do you phase him out, or is it shorter term than that, or do you go the full two years on a gradual incline? If we keep it up too long, we build in a crutch, and we don't get the transition as you mentioned before. They don't get to the point where they can go back and explain to their parents what they have learned.

DR. FARRIS: Let me first say that I think the amount of time required depends very much on the school and what they emphasize. Let me also say that up to now everybody thinks of orientation as being a time when you ought to be just pussycatting around. I am thinking in terms of a rigorous and innovating program that helps span the fact that this student has not had magazines to read all his life, has come to college with very little real knowledge of what college is about and needs to have this period spanned by somebody. It ought to be as rigorous as possible, and as realistic as possible, so that the student does not go on to school where he is frightened again after being made confident.

You see, this should be a period where he's exposed to manual skills and he's exposed to basic, maybe reading specialists, maybe writing, things in which he feels inadequate or things in which by admission tests, the college has found he is inadequate.

The student is still going to need help that first year, but he ought to be put into the mainstream as soon as possible, competing with the regular students, with help, which is why I gave those freshmen students help this year. This summer we had our orientation period and we threw them immediately into the regular courses supplemented in the evening with my course. These students now feel good. They feel confident. They feel they can make it because they have competed with other students and, they don't have to take low man on the totem pole to anybody. Competing with students can help. Some of them have winged themselves. They feel they no longer need that program. Because I can only take a limited number, they've stepped aside in order that other kids can enter.

If I can ask you one question, I'm wondering how many of you are going out tomorrow to the State Board of Education to get this A.A. in teaching credential that I mentioned?

PROF. HANSON: I have a suggestion that might save you some trouble semantically. There is a notion which is already in existence in some schools of a function called a teacher apprentice which does not take any--in fact, it doesn't even exist on paper some places. We have students at Rockland who go out to some of the local schools. This program started out in child psychology where students visited the classes. Then we worked out an informal arrangement with the superintendents whereby if the teacher and the student mutually agree, the teacher could put the student to work as an apprentice. The old apprenticeship system at work except that nobody pays anybody, and the gains are so great that we have had some of our students become teachers with the A.A. degree. I have a gal who's been teaching third grade for three years, and she just didn't bother to go on to any of the rest because she found her niche and it was great.

DR. FARRIS: Kind of like practice teaching at a college.

PROF. HANSON: Well, you see practice teaching is under the jurisdiction of the State Education Department. That's a formal program, and is always under the control of the senior colleges.

DR. FARRIS: Well, the State of California recently passed a resolution whereby they are going to start this kind of program. S.F. Walter has written an interesting article on this. He also has a tremendous number of good ideas under the black agenda.

MR. GRAY: In New York State there is no credential on the A.A. teaching levels. New York State does have a junior college credential and community college boards of trustees do have policies on hiring and general standards and employment practices, but there are no credentials per se that are conferred by the State Education Law beyond the four-year colleges.

DR. FARRIS: Let me ask this question then: Suppose I majored in education. The Education Department has this thing all set up. Why is it that I have to take certain specified courses before I can go out and teach?

MR. GRAY: At the elementary and secondary level, not at the college level. Community colleges are exempt.

DR. FARRIS: So if I finished, if I took a program in engineering or any of these so-called career programs that lead to something further in the two-year college, I could teach at a two-year college.

MR. GRAY: Yes, we have lots of people that have absolutely no degrees at all. They have industrial experience which make them specialists because of know-how. Also they may have had some kind of experience that is different and apart from that you normally get academically and they are employed.

DR. FARRIS: Let me ask you this improtant question; Could these persons go and teach in a four-year college?

DR. COLLINS: Yes.

MR. GRAY: I can't speak for the four-year colleges.

PROF. HANSON: Technically they could, but--there won't be many.

DR. COLLINS: Some teach with no credentials at all

DR. FARRIS: You say this, but you try to get them to hire somebody without a degree or without a Bachelor's, without a Master's.

MR. KLEGMAN: This is something, you realize the computer programer doesn't have to have a high school equivalency to teach at a college.

Also, you didn't touch too much on the subject of the Spanish-speaking student. We have a very large Spanish-speaking population and yet are unable to attract and draw students onto campus from this group. How about some observations on that problem?

DR. FARRIS: I had suggested under one of the programs that you have an orientation program specifically for Puerto Rican students in which non-Castillian dialect Spanish be utilized. As a matter of fact, it wouldn't be bad to have that kind of course for all the students in that area to make them feel more comfortable. The Puerto Rican students do have a severe problem. Every bit as severe as the black student problem, and they should be given special consideration. The same things that I said ought to apply to them. The only difference in programs that I can see is something to help them overcome the language barrier, since most of the black students from disadvantaged areas speak non-standard English anyway.

MR. KLEGMAN: Is there a college preparation type of program that you know of for Spanish-speaking peoples?

DR. FARRIS: We took Puerto Rican Spanish students through our program his summer. I had some Puerto Rican students in my program. treated them very much like the black students except for he language problem. For most of them, the language problem s not great. The majority are from the New York and the Lon Island area, and they do not have as many problems. They retain the ability to speak the language as a code of identification really. I know my students enjoy speaking Spanis to one another around the campus. It make them feel unite. I think that's very good and very important, and I would b horrified if anybody said anything against having the Puero Rican students continue to speak Spanish to one another. Tey ought to be able to keep their subculture identification.

MR. ROBBINS: You make a point about a teacher giving a concept without illustrations. Please review this one point again.

DR. FARRIS: One of the greatest problems that I have seen in teachers so far is that most of those in two-year colleges and universities are from middle class backgrounds. The average student going to the two-year college and the university is of middle class background. Hence, for years, and presently today, the teacher speaks in terms of new concepts which are documented and illustrated by middle class examples because both they and the student are familiar with this type of example. It leaves the black student, the disadvantaged student, completely out in the cold because he is unfamiliar with the concept and the unfamiliar illustration. It's a very frustrating experience for the disadvantaged student.

This year, for a good example, I tried an interesting experiment in my own class where I teach biology. We had students who were taking an introductory class in biology. For the most part the lecturer used the drosophila fruitfly to discuss intensifying genes. These are genes that make the wing either shorter or longer depending on how many of the genes are present. For my students I used human skin color so that they could understand that human skin color is modified or intensified, both blacker and whiter, by the number of intensifying gene factors present. These students were able to understand the concept much better. The students were very pleased that out of the 63 disadvantaged students, mostly black and Puerto Rican, who took my review class, and were also taking the regular introductory course, 90 percent got a C average or better in the class. They were able to handle the exam material and the concepts with great adeptness after having examples with which they were familiar rather than examples which another teacher, who was not familiar with their background, might have given them.

PROF. HANSON: How much of that do you think is due to that special concern, and how much of it really lies in the openness and honesty that you are also talking about? In other words, do you have to set up special courses for this kind of thing or can you creat an atmosphere?

DR. FARRIS: I think it's a concept and, as a matter of fact, it's one of the things that I'm working on right now. For instance, I always use the declarative sentences to teach mathematics. People who say they have a mathematical block are talking a about symbols and numbers. So, I don't use symbols and numbers. I might begin the student with a sentence such as: interest equals principal times rate times time which is what i = prt is. Now, interest, principals, time, rates, these are familiar words, and very easily you can get the student to work out verbal problems on a declarative sentence basis. It is only when they feel comfortable with being able to translate a sentence into a formula that I take them into using numbers and symbols. It is a concentric process.

PROF: HANSON: I guess what I'm saying is, the student must feel free to question the teacher. If that relationship can be set up so that no matter what the teacher tries to communicate, if he doesn't, then the student lets him know instantly, and it's not resented by the teacher. This then becomes a creative relationship.

DR. FARRIS: I remember when I was a student taking advanced medical entymology, I couldn't tell a tic from a nit unless I developed a feeling, and I looked in the microscope to tell me, which is very unscientific. I developed the same sort of feeling from the class because I usually teach with a certain amount of rhetoric. I'll put a concept on the board, and I'll start going into explanations. I'll "rap" questions back at them. When I find that they are not enthusiastically answering these questions, I know I've got a problem. Therefore, I stop and redraft it. Just last Monday night I was talking to the students about DNA. I had given them the concept of conservative versus semi-conservative. Now, these terms meant something totally different to them, and as I put them on in a scientific manner, the students were somewhat puzzled because it did not fit. You know, the word "conservative" to them meant opposed to change, it didn't mean to conserve. In those terms I'm popping questions at them, and I noticed this type of mumble-mumble-mumble. I stopped and talked about the word "conservative." This gave them time to readjust their idea to conserve rather than opposed to change, and then they were able to pick it back up.

We have reached that point now where they will say, "Look here, I just don't understand what you're talking about, break it down and lay it on me because I don't understand it at all." The braver ones will say that. Sometimes if I know one student who has problems, I will say to him "do you understand," and if so, go to the board and explain to the rest of us." Frequently, one or two students, will grasp the point and can then do a better job explaining it to the rest of the students than I could because they know what it is that's troubling them. I encourage this. Unfortunately, you see, one of the negative advantages I have right now which makes me very suspect is having a Ph.D. So I have to overcome that for the students at first, and they're a little hesitant. They feel I've been sold a bill of goods, and I don't understand them.

To overcome this feeling I "rap" with them. Eventually they'll come to the point where they'll ask me things like "how did you stay with the system that long and not be destroyed." You sit and you talk about it with them. You go over and take a coffee break and sit over at the union and talk with them a little. But in addition, I think one of the real needs right now is for black students to come in contact more with black black faculty members and black administrators who care about them and not just about themselves. I've been to many of your schools just because they don't have many black faculty. I go around and rap with the kids and play cards with them and ask them what their problems are. I've also asked for black weekends. It is very important that they come in contact with more people like themselves who are undergoing these same kinds of experiences. They share their feelings about living within this climate, and also how one is able to continue to function with the other black people.

DR. COLLINS: I'm wondering what your reaction is to abandoning the college that has the white majority and moving to an ethnic center where the ethnicity can be emphasized and where greater identity can be the core of the curriculum?

DR. FARRIS: I certainly think black identity is very, very important particularly at this time. One of the problems with such a move is the limited scope that such a program would have. I'm sure you are aware there are some fields in which we have very few black people. What would happen to black people who wanted to major in such a field? It would be a difficulty at this time which I think is just one argument. On the other hand, I can see some merit to such a program, particularly as a preparatory program prior to entrance into a university. It could shore them up and build up their confidence. We must help to get rid of the self doubts and get these students oriented so they feel comfortable and happy with their blackness and its merits.

DR. WOLFBEIN: Well, following up on that, what do you do with a character like myself who is white who has a heck of a time coping with some of the students. What would be an example? You mentioned the one about Afro-American. Well, there are a hell of a lot of blacks in my school who would draw and quarter me if I call them Afro-Americans. What do I do about it? Could it be that some blacks just don't want to be called Afro-Americans?

DR. FARRIS: I think Afro-Americans is a good and respectable term. I think those over 30 are still wondering what happend to the integration bit and how come I'm now black. However, I feel one has to think in terms of where the group that is going to be the nucleus, the real core, is moving toward. I think Afro-American is at least historically founded. "Negro" was certainly historically founded since that was the slave name, but I'm talking about pleasantly historically founded.

DR. WOLBEIN: The blacks voted at our school and they said something about Afro-Asian.

DR. FARRIS: I would not call myself Afro-Asian. I can understand the Afro-Asian, the third world concept, but I would never vote to have myself called an Afro-Asian. But I do think the name thing is a critical factor right now. You see, we do have the black movement going on. I don't think anybody can deny that at this point. I can really remember them finally capitalizing the "N" for Negro. I think that it's vitally important that we do give black people, Afro-American, real honest respect. The younger people are very strong in their feeling of black is beautiful, black is proud.

On our own campus not all the students would vote to have themselves called Afro-American, but I think those who are involved right now in blackness and understanding blackness so that they can afford to move in any direction after it, would prefer the term black or Afro-American because it gives them a place from which to begin. It gives them a pride beyond the term Negro because Negro is a color, whereas Afro-American is an origin, evolutionary origin.

DR. WOLFBEIN: Would you also advocate this in the high school?

DR. FARRIS: High schools are still in very serious straits and certainly need a lot of help. They still won't encourage or tell our students of the opportunities and why, what it means, and what is the difference between going to college and not going to college. In our country which is technology oriented, this is a very, very solid problem. This means the difference between a job and a career.

THE CAREER VIEW

Seymour L. Wolfbein

Now Dean of the School of Business Administration at Temple University Dr. Wolfbein is perhaps best known for his extensive federal government activity on employment, training, and related economic problems, and as a consultant on career guidance programs. He was graduated from Brooklyn College, and holds his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia University. From 1942-1966 he worked in the U.S. Department of Labor as Chief, Occupational Outlook Division, Divison of Manpower and Employment; Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor; Director of the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training; and Special Assistant to the Secretary for Economic Affairs. He came to Temple as Professor of Economics and Dean in 1967. Dr. Wolfbein's writings represent some of the basic reference materials on employment and unemployment developments and occupational information for career guidance as well as automation, training and retraining.

From a career vantage point, which by its very nature is a long range view, the community college and its constituencies are confronted by seven critical trends which together represent the environmental challenges we all have to face.

SEVEN SIGNS FOR THE SEVENTIES

These seven signs for the seventies which, in fact, have been signalling us for some time now and on which the documentation is significant and substantial can be recapitulated briefly as follows:

1. Technological Change. The trilogy of new machinery, new methods of organization and management, and new products have combined to generate a 100 percent increase in output per worker in the U.S.A. in the quarter of a century since the end of World War II. To double the amount of goods and services produced by every hour of work is an enormous achievement for any country, but particularly so for a country as already economically advanced as ours was to begin with.

Although pervasive throughout the economy let us emphasize the interdependence of the American social and economic scene by noting the fact that the biggest productivity increases have occurred in agriculture, that more than 200,000 jobs have disappeared from the farm in each of the past twenty years, and that this bit of action is most visible in terms of people in the ghettos of the inner cities, metropolitan America.

2. Industrial and Occupational Change. This leads into the second point that we have become the only country in the world where the majority of persons who work produce a service rather than some tangible good which you and I use. Thus we are the only country in the world where the single biggest bloc of workers is in the white collar category.

Industrially the work balance sheet for the end of 1969 reads as follows:

Goods Producing Industries		Service Producing Industries	
Mining	.6	Transportation and Public Utilities	4.5
Contract Construction	3.5	Trade	15.0
Manufacturing	20.1	Finance, insurance, real estate	3.6
Agriculture	3.3	Service	11.2
		Government	12.5
	27.5		46.8

The dynamics of this change are illustrated by the fact that as late as 1950, the goods-producing sector still employed more workers than the service-producing sector; it lost the lead shortly thereafter and it has not been a race since.

There are few social, economic and political forces in this country which are not grounded in this phenomenon--including career development for the young, changing income distributions or changing profiles of union organization and strength.

It is extraordinary to ponder the fact that only 600,000 wage and salary workers are needed to man all of our extractive industries--coal, lead, uranium, zinc, iron, gold, silver, copper, petroleum, etc.; that a construction labor force averaging only about three and a half million can start more than a million homes a year, put up all the school buildings, office buildings, stores, factories, bridges and highways, etc.; that three and a half million persons can produce all the feed, food and fiber for a population of more than 200 million and still have surpluses. In the meantime, the burgeoning areas are those which move the goods around, buy and sell, and extend the myriad of personal services involved in finance, entertainment, health, education, recreation, etc.

Occupationally, the picture for 1969 looked like this:

Total employment	100%
White collar	48
Professional	14
Managerial	10
Clerical	17
Sales	7
Blue Collar	36
Skilled	13
Semiskilled	18
Unskilled	5
Service	12
Farm	4

For the first time in history, the number of professional personnel alone now exceeds all of the skilled workers--and this in the prime industrial nation of the world. Twenty years ago the proportion of the employed work force which was skilled was double that of professional personnel.

Another sign of the time is the almost incredible upturn in the clerical staff which is now only one percentage point behind the semiskilled which include the millions of factory assembly line workers. The trend is inexorable and within a blink of time, clerical personnel will take over the number one spot in the occupational standings.

Thus, under the impact of a changing technological environment, the job world has changed its profile irreversibly and we have become a service oriented, white collar economy par excellence.

3. Geographic Change. The map of the world of work has been dramatically altered as well. Today, more than one out of every six jobs (18 percent) are located in just three states: California, Texas and Florida. One out of every three engineers work in just one state: California. The peer among economic regions, the Middle Atlantic States (New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania) has ceded first place in number of jobs to the industrial North Central States (Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Iowa). Every state of the deep South has moved its employment above the national average; every state of the industrial Northeast has decreased its relative position in the employment ranks since the end of World War II.

And, of course, people have been on the move, too. More than 70 percent of the population of the U.S.A. now lives in an urban setting. In the face of a 28 million population increase in the past decade, the rural population fell by 400,000.

The geographic problem is, of course, more than a state or region one. Some of its most pressing aspects are local ones with the population mass moving into the suburban areas ringing the inner cities of the megalopolis, as has the bulk of new job growth.

Americans, as usual, have been highly and responsively mobile as the terrain of the job world has changed. But, the resulting concentrations of social, economic and political problems are huge and also call for new designs in public and private policies and programs.

4. Educational Change. The changes enumerated so far have been accompanied by, indeed require some other shifts and none perhaps has been as large as the rise in schooling among the population. In the fall of 1968, an unprecedented total of 58 million persons in the age bracket 3 to 34 years were enrolled in some formal educational institution ranging from nursery school to graduate curricula in universities. By now, more than 97 percent of elementary school age youngsters are in school, as are more than 95 percent of the secondar- school age youth. But even more than one out of every eight 3 and 4 year olds now attend nursery school and almost one out of every two people who graduate from high school go on to college.

All of this has spilled over into the labor force and by now the average worker in this country has more than a high school education. The median years of school attained by the labor force is now 12.5. Professional personnel are now averaging more than 16 years (a baccalaureate). In fact, among the various population groups--whatever they be classified by age, sex, color, marital status, etc.--the higher the number of school years attained, the higher is their labor force participation rates, the lower their unemployment rates, the higher their incomes, the lower their rates of involuntary part time work, the higher their place on the occupational ladder.

However, as any employer knows, there can be a major difference between years of school completed and educational attainment. With all due respect to the high school diploma, it does not necessarily guarantee that its holder can perform even the most elementary steps in reading, writing and arithmetic. That this is more than just a reflection on a number of separate experiences by employing institutions, can be seen from the carefully documented U.S. Labor Department study which showed that 20 percent of the young men who flunk the armed forces Qualification Test (equivalent of a little under an eight grade education) have a high school diploma.

5. Income Change. In 1968, the median money income of American families was $8,632, up a very substantial and significant 70 percent over the figure for 1958. Even when adjusted for the increase in prices during this period of time, the upturn still amounts to about 40 percent in family income.

In 1968, one out of every seven families had a money income of $15,000 a year or more, six times the corresponsing ratio of ten years prior to that. In aggregate terms America has moved into the 1970's as an affluent society, helped by an unprecedented string of successive years of economic growth and prosperity, the very technological, industrial and occupational changes already described and the huge inflow of women into the labor force described later on (in 37 percent of all husband-wife families, the wife is a member of the paid labor force.)

Poverty still persists as a major problem in this country, of course. One out of every ten whites and one out every three non-whites were living below government defined levels of poverty in 1968. Their problems are more clearly etched, however, by the very affluence enjoyed by the others.

6. Population Change. Post World War II American has witnessed a burgeoning population growth which has moved the total past the 200 million mark and all of the changes recorded in this section have to be seen in this context. Birth rates have declined in recent years, but they are being experienced by the huge cohorts born right after World War II and now of marriageable and child bearing age, so that the actual numbers appearing on the scene every year are still very large. One out of every three people alive in the U.S.A. today was not alive fifteen years ago.

One of the more interesting aspects of population change, i.e., the increasing numbers of young and old, has been the sharp upturn in the so-called dependency ratio, which represents the relationship between the numbers of people who are either under 18 or 65 years of age to those 18 to 64 years of age. The former group encompasses most of those who are still too young, the latter those too old to be in the labor force. The dependency ratio moved from 64 to 84, up almost one-third between 1950 and 1965.

7. Manpower Change. The 1960's have begun to witness the scheduled spill over of the population into the labor force and we are witnessing an unprecedented net increase in workers of 26 million during the current decade. In fact, the working population is rising at a more rapid rate than the total population, no mean feat in an era of a population boom.

What is perhaps more important, however, is the emergence of a unique hourglass configuration to the American labor force, generated by the back-to-back occurrence of the very low birth rates of a depression decade and a very high birth rate of the post World War II period. We illustrate by the following age distribution of the net increase in the work force for the 1960's, for which the returns are practically all in

Total	100%
16-24	47
25-34	13
35-44	-1
45+	41

It turns out, incidentally, that what has been called "manpower" is simply an extension of the male ego, because the majority of entrants into the labor force during the past twenty years were women, who already account for about 37 percent of all workers.

The sharpest increases in worker rates actually have occurred among married women. In fact, the increase in the number of married women workers during the past two decades was bigger than the corresponding increase among all men put together. For the first time in our history, the majority of women who working this country are married, not single.

Surprisingly to many, the biggest relative increase in labor force participation rates occurred among mothers with children under three years of age. One out of every four of these women are now workers, the presence or absence of day care centers, baby sitters, mothers-in-law, etc. to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is difficult to say which is cause and which effect (the chances are they were both) but the emergence of a service producing, white collar economy would have been impossible during the past generation without the influx of the women workers into such areas as health service and education and clerical work.

Some idea of the burgeoning change is shown by the increase among secretaries, stenographers and typists of one million just in the period 1959-68.

THE OUTLOOK TO 1975

Looking into the future is always a chancy business, but for reasons which will be cited, guaging the outlook, particularly in manpower terms to 1975, is a relatively safe exercise. At any rate, making some assessment of the immediate years ahead and designing appropriate policies and programs is a matter of primary importance for both public and private enterprise if we are to emerge in viable shape to celebrate the bicentennial of this country's independence.

As a matter of fact, each of the seven signs mentioned so far, is susceptible to a reasonably accurate projection for the next half dozen years. For example, it would be difficult to gainsay a projection of technological change over this span of time of less than the rate which has prevailed during the past quarter of a century. The expectations are not only for full realization of future generations of computer technology of incalculable speed, accuracy and implication, but for the development and utilization of technology in sectors which have lagged up to now. The textile industry, for example, which now has the lowest rates of non-production workers to total work force of any of the 21 major industry divisions in manufacturing, has recently climbed aboard the technological circuit and bids fair, in its new spindles and looms, materials handling equipment, manmade fibers and production organization, to take on again some of the attributes which make it one of the first areas of the Industrial Revolution.

It is in the area of manpower, the particular emphasis of this paper, that the projections are most nearly apt to be on the head. In looking ahead to the kind of labor force we will have in 1975, for example, the arithmetic already has been irretrievably written. Everyone who will be in the worker population in 1975 already has been born.

There are five major facets of the social/economic/manpower environment which warrant emphasis in looking ahead to 1975.

The first is summarized in Table 1 below which describes the changes in the size and composition of the labor force taking place between 1965 and 1975. These changes highlight

- The unprecedented large increase in the work force of 15 million or 20 percent.
- The sharply differentiated changes among the different age groups, accentuating the hour glass configuration already mentioned.
- We are now in the midst of experiencing decline of one million workers in the age group 35-44.
- The biggest increases will occur in the adjacent age group 25-34, which will rise by 6 million, or 40 percent, or double the overall rate of increase in the working population which is in itself in the midst of an unparalleled upturn.
- The continuing uptrend among women workers who are scheduled to score differentially larger rates of increase in the labor force participation, as they have done throughout the post World War II era.
- The enormous increase among the nonwhite labor force, calling for a 50 percent increase in their young members of the working population. Among new workers, employers are going to find that one out of every seven is going to be nonwhite.

TABLE 1

Labor Force Changes 1965-1975 by Age, Sex and Color

Percent Change

	White		Nonwhite	
Age	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	16%	25%	27%	25%
16-19	19	23	46	70
20-24	39	43	50	52
25-34	40	44	48	28
35-44	-9	-2	1	-5
45-54	6	23	12	24
55-64	15	36	18	26
65+	-2	25	-2	8

The second is the continued drive toward an even more concentrated service-producing, white collar economy as indicated in Table 2. Should these developments actually ensue, (and so far their projections are right on the mark), then 1975 will see

-- Two out of every three workers producing services rather than goods.

-- More than one in six workers employed by a government agency, most of them at local level.

-- Less than 5 percent of the labor force responsible for all of agricultural production.

-- One out of every five workers earning a living by buying or selling in trade.

-- One out of every two workers in the white collar category.

-- Less than five percent of the entire, working population in unskilled labor.

As these trends apparently gain momentum in moving toward 1975 in the third place, the danger signals are there for all to see. For example, if nonwhites continue to prove gains in their industrial and occupational status as they have throughout the post World War II period, their unemployment rate in 1975 would be five times the national average, instead of about two to two-and-a-half times the overall rate it is now. As the first two points indicate, there is a built in clock--one of whose hands is the huge nonwhite labor force increase, the other their differentially skewed job distribution--which keeps ticking away as the calendar moves to 1975.

TABLE 2

Industrial and Occupational Trends 1965-1975

Projected Industry Changes		Projected Occupational Changes	
Industry	Change '65-'75	Occupation	Change '65-'75
Total	22%	Total	22%
Goods Producing	7	White Collar	33
Mining	-2	Professional	45
Contract construction	32	Managerial	25
Manufacturing	9	Clerical	31
Agriculture	-18	Sales	23
Service Producing	32	Blue Collar	14
Transportation and public utilities	12	Skilled	24
Trade	27	Semiskilled	12
Finance, insurance, real estate	23	Unskilled	-3
Service	42	Service	35
Government	39	Farm	-18

As these trends apparently gain momentum in moving toward 1975 *in the fourth place*, the encouraging signals are there for all to see *as well*. While still not enough to make an appreciable dent, the real live world of work has witnessed gains in the occupational and industrial reemployment of the nonwhite, for example. The significant manpower demands, currently and, apparently in the offing, provide a base of effective demand for further progress. The deficit of working population in the critical age group 35-44 means that all employers will have to accelerate the career development of the younger person, which is exactly where the major work force increases are scheduled to appear, as indeed they already are.

THE CUTTING EDGE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

From the point of view of the student, but of no less importance to faculty and administration, is the key fact that the challenges these forces represent can be perceived most clearly if not most starkly by dissecting them.

For example, it is a theme of this paper that each of the trends enumerated so far is potentially a very beneficent one. Rising technology, more white collar work, increasing schooling, increasing income, for example, can and have generated rising levels of living, more person-to-person services, etc.

However, no one can really assess the current scene nor discern their portents without calling attention to the fact that significant numbers and proportions of the population are not riding these important trends.

For example, we have underlined the growth of the white collar economy--a perfectly valid point for the white population. But as the 1970's begin, one finds that 20 percent of all the Negro men who work, are in just one occupational category, i.e., unskilled labor, the only nonfarm group which has declined in numbers as well as percent during the post World War II period. The situation is even more concentrated among the Negro women workers where 50 percent work in just one occupational category, i.e., the service occupations which include domestics, chambermaids, waitresses, etc.

Every one of the trends discussed so far can be similarly taken apart, as can many more, and they all yield similar kinds of confrontation with which public and private policy and programs will be faced at the community college level.

For the many of us who have been involved in the evolution of the community college idea, the beginning of the seventies represents a fascinating turn of events indeed because there are few educational institutions which at this juncture of history have the potential for immediacy and responsiveness to all of the challenges we have enumerated.

For this potential to be fulfilled, however, the activities in the two-year colleges have to be predicated upon three propositions, each of which is often accepted in principle but quite as often is not carried through. From a career point of view (and no doubt from all other points of view) they are an absolutely necessary condition for a correct course of action for the 1970's.

1. Education at the community college level has to be provided in an affirmatively articulated process which guarantees the absence of discrimination. To put it more positively, perhaps, the proposition has to be self evident that everyone must have the opportunity to engage in this arena. To those who may be impatient with the obviousness of this formulation, let it be emphasized that it is hard to see how civil liberty can really be viable without some deliberate dent being made on the educational deficits among those who have had a hard time of it because of their color or ethnic origin and that the community college can provide an unmatched variety of curricula leading to employment prospects which are excellent now and for the foreseeable future.

2. It also has to be accepted that everyone should have access to this kind of educational opportunity, it should also be a tenet of the field that people can be motivated, guided and counseled to be successful once they have this opportunity. We have a vast documentation from thousands of programs of the past decades to show that programs with sufficient resources, particularly if they are individually oriented, produce successful transactions with the educational environment.

3. From a career point of view, the community college has to see itself from that most difficult position of moving in tandem relationship to what has preceded it (the K-12 years) and what lies ahead in terms of further

education and training as well as the various ports of entry into the job market. The chances are that the seventies are going to make it even more necessary than ever before that the community college take a most discerning look at how it functions in terms of its position on the educational continuum and how it responds to job market activity.

Three specific strategies are offered to facilitate these conditions.

1. The first recognizes in an overt and deliberate manner that the clients of the community colleges are going to be about as varied as the population itself is--in terms of age, color, social and economic status, aptitude, talent, interest and previous conditions of education. Under these circumstances, the responsive community college will establish curricula which are geared to individual differentials, which are paced to the prospects that its clients will vary from those whose transactions with the institution will be relatively brief and whose entry into the job market is more imminent than not, to those who will end up in university graduate work. It is here that the creativity and innovativeness of design of curricula are critical.

2. The second and equally difficult, though crucially interdependent with the first, is a design which permits two processes for all students. To be responsive to the job market as it is and is expected to be, the community college has to provide clear and accessible pathways among the various curricula which it has established to effect the first strategy, i.e., students must be able to (and be able to perceive this ability) change their courses of action without loss of status, credits and all other stigmata of academia. In fact, it is difficult if not impossible to see how guidance, counseling and advisement are to any avail under any but these circumstance. In addition, and complementarily, these curricula and their access have to be available even if a student enters and exits, e.g. to and from the institution and the job market a number of times. Imagine the enormous contribution that community colleges could make by dropping the word "dropout" and deliberating welcoming aboard and perhaps even giving credit for the experience of having run the gauntlet of the job market.

3. The third relates to the variety of supportive services which are sina qua non for success for significant numbers of students and which recognize the enormously hostile environment from which many come. Included, aside from the various guidance, counseling and advisement services are three which warrant separate mention. One is the need for providing job-related basic education on a remedial basis; the second is the provision of job-related instruction and experience, involving everything from attitudes toward the world of work to actual contact with a job to which coop work programs are ideally suited; the third is actual follow up and feed back on the determinants of success and failure.

The pursuit of these goals can put the community college in the forefront of what we have defined as the nature of the very process of education itself: that it is the process of enabling a person to withstand, and indeed profit from, the inevitable changes which will take place in the relationship between what he has learned and what he will be called upon to perform in the world of work.

Note: The points made in this paper are based on the following more extensive materials prepared by the author in (1) Occupational Information: A Career Guidance View, New York, Random House, 1967; (2) The Emerging Labor Force: A Strategy for the Seventies, Washington, D.C., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1968; (3) Strategic Factors in Vocational Education and Training for the Urban Disadvantaged, New York, Committee for Economic Development, 1969.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

DR. GRAGG: I would like to ask some of the people here if what you have said has been as disconcerting to them as it has to me. Some of the things that you've said, of course, I know we have heard about, but you bother me. I wonder if there are others who had the same reaction and would you like to raise a question or an argument with Dean Wolfbein about this?

MR. GRAY: Yes, could we take your hour glass just a little further down the road and see what's going to happen when this bottleneck becomes the bottom of the hour glass. This is one of the things that got to me immediately because I extrapolated it a few years beyond. Will we lose the hour glass and have just a square tumbler, or is it going to bulge at the younger age?

DR. WOLFBEIN: That's going to depend on what happens to births. You're absolutely right. It's fascinating to take the age group 35 to 45 in 1975 which is the deficit group and move that one along. If you do, it's just a fascinating exercise because around the year 2005, this huge group is going to be coming up and taking its place. What's going to happen to the manpower profile will depend a great deal on the birth rate, and we don't know what's going to happen there. You see, what gives us this profile now is a sort of one-two punch we've had, with a very low birth rate for a string of years followed by an era of very high birth rates. It's almost side by side, and that's why you've got this kind of situation.

What's going to happen, what's following this big globule now, I really don't know. All I know is that for many, many years to come certainly for the rest of our working lives, even for many of the young people here, the sheer numbers to cope with in the educational work force arena are going to be absolutely unprecedented. One thing I don't think we have to worry about is workload.

MR. GRAY: This bottleneck though has tremendous implications in the realms of future education. Where are we going to get the experience that we need to cope with all this?

DR. WOLFBEIN: Just a fast word on this. I come from the Labor Department, and I apologize for this, but there's one of the Bureaus in there called the Bureau of Employment Security which was always very big on older workers. When I became Deputy Assistant Secretary, a Deputy Secretary had a number of bureaus reporting to him, and one of them was the Bureau of Employment Security of which Bob Widlin was director at that time. Bob Widlin and Ed McVeigh, Personnel Director, and I entered into a pact. I'd like to report this because it's one of the few experiments in the social sciences that I know about in this field.

The three of us agreed that for one year whenever there was a vacancy for a secretary we would send to the professional person involved two women, one in her twenties and one in her forties. This from a Bureau which would give way to noboby in their love for what we call the mature worker. I must report to you that not in 86 percent of the cases or 92 percent of the cases but in 100 percent of the cases, employers took the lady in her twenties. I don't care how many pi squares you apply that is statistically significant. I have given up on the proposition that we're somehow going to go out and hire all the workers. I hope I'm wrong. I think what this means is that we've got to put many more chips in educating and training, in recruiting, in selecting, in utilizing and all the other words we use, of the so-called younger group coming up.

I remind you that some of it's heavily female. You can keep the term "manpower" which must have been invented by a man, but again it's gratuitous to tell you that 38 percent of all workers in this country are now women. If the job thing is going to go the way we think it is and continue to be service oriented and white collar oriented, you know where the action is going to be in terms of women. You've heard me say that the average high school girl today is going to get married and have kids. This is the overwhelming majority. Nevertheless, the average high school girl today will spend 25 years of her remaining lifetime as a worker.

Now, as some of you know, we have tables of working liege. We shall tell you the actuarial basis for that. This is not just a crystal ball. There are many different pieces in the population, and you're perfectly right in terms of leadership and all the other things we're hoping for. It's going to be a different ball game.

DR. HITCHCOCK: I would like to comment on your seventh point. Mike Coherin and Bob Theobald, the economists, put forth the idea that we're going to have a certain percentage of the population that will never be able to join in the work force, and that will simply never be able to connect with it. If this is the case, there are tremendous implications for education. It's about six years since they postulated that idea. We are already starting to move into the guaranteed minimum income which is related to that point. I wondered if you would comment on that.

DR. WOLFBEIN: I think yourquestion may very well be at the nub of the matter. I would like to respond to it very briefly as follows: First of all, as I roam around the country, this is the question that's asked of me most. It's asked in all sorts of forms and in some places like Seattle from which I just returned, you know what the question is, what happens when peace breaks out? Many of them use fancy terms like what's going to happen when the revolution in automation and cybernetics takes over. I think the question can be answered as follows: Back in 1960, President Eisenhower appointed a Commission on American Goals. It was chaired by a very interesting man by the name of Rockefeller and he asked this commission to do the following--this is 1960 mind you--he said take a look at 1975 and tell us where the United States of America should be in 1975 and put it in terms of American goals. That was the name of the report when it came out. They took 15 American goals and you can name them just as well as Mr. Rockefeller, with all due respect. You know, education, housing, transportation and all the rest. They projected them where they thought the United States ought to be by 1975. I would like to report to you, ladies and gentlemen, that several years ago when I was still in the Labor Department, we asked a private research group to take that particular report, which in no way could be called a wild-eyed radical look ahead, to add one more goal because it was on the horizon, space, and to do the following. They were not to tell us how much they thought it was going to cost, but to tell us something which we thought was much more important, how many workers would it take to consummate those goals in 1975. The answer to that, I think, should be the answer we give whenever that constellation of questions, that you posed, is asked.

You know how the answer came out? If we are to realize these rather conservatively stated goals which are only five years away, it will take 14 million more workers than the Labor Department says we're going to have altogether in 1975. The answer really is it's up to us. If we want to support the consummation of those conservatively stated goals in education, housing and etc., we'll run out of workers. The answer to the question about automation which eliminates many jobs and leads to much unemployment becomes circular reasoning almost. I don't mean to be political, but if we as a country decide to put our chips on these goals, you don't have to worry. However, if we want to constrain what's going to happen, it's what's happening now. I means there's no magic to this. I don't know of anybody, including the President of the United States, who didn't say that the unemployment rate was going to go up. I mean you don't need a fancy crystal ball to know what is going to happen when you move from the 25 billion dollar deficit in the budget situation to a surplus. I know of no country in the world and no period in history when a decrease in spending didn't cause an increase in the unemployment rate.

Now, I'm not asking whether it's good or bad. I leave that to your judgement. All I'm saying is that it's really going to depend on whether we put enough chips on those goals.

DR. GRAGG: Let me throw one at you. Going back to the early part of your talk, do you see the Northeast becoming a human desert as all this change takes place?

DR. WOLFBEIN: Well, the easy answer is to say no. Increasing job opportunities don't necessarily bring with them the increased qualitative aspects of work that we might hope for. As I look at some of the Northeast and some of the places in which we reside, I think it's quite possible that we can support a decent economic base and maybe make out better qualitatively. It depends, however, on whether the goals that we set up are really structured. For example, if it's really true that we're all projecting a simply enormous increase, not only in numbers but rates in the educational arena, the Northeast could do very, very well with that, couldn't it? Then we could set up an educational plant that would be out of this world and put our chips on that one. We would have less mines and their slackage maybe in Pennsylvania and we'd have more state universities and state colleges and community colleges, and what's wrong with that. That would be just great. Let somebody else have the oil refineries and all the rest. I'm not knocking oil refineries. What I'm saying is that the changing geography of American industry has a lot of opportunity in it for some of the other states, but whether we want to grab those opportunities, again I think is the big question. It could be great. For example, I'm a newcomer to Pennsylvania, and I tell you it's a shocker to go to some of these cities and see the devastation wrought by some of these goods-producing industries. It's a beautiful state, or could be, and if we have a little sense and put our chips in the right place, we would turn this around to great advantage. I think we've got a great opportunity.

III. COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION AND THE 1970'S

FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

Merritt M. Chambers

Dr. Chambers, now professor of Educational Administration, Illinois State University, in Normal, Illinois, also serves as a special contributor on the Chronicle of Higher Education. He received his B.A. from Ohio Weslayan University and his M.A. and Ph.D. from Ohio State University. He served as a staff member on the American Council on Education from 1935 through 1951. More recently he was a professor of higher education at the University of Michigan from 1958 through 1963, and then at Indiana University from 1963 to the summer of 1969. Among his publications are: The Campus and the People, 1960; Chance and Choice in Higher Education, 1962; Financing Higher Education, 1963; and numerous articles in professional journals.

What follows will be brief, simple, and skeletal. Consider first, financial aids for community college students; and second, financial support of the community colleges. By "community colleges" is meant, in the United States, some seven hundred institutions offering two years of instruction and training at the level immediately above the high school. Ideally these are comprehensive junior colleges, offering "college-parallel" programs, general education, technical and occupational training, not only to 18 and 19 year old recent high school graduates, but also these and other services to adults beyond conventional college ages.

FINANCING COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

The public community college is largely a local institution, located within commuting-distance of the homes of most of its students. One of its principal merits is that it attracts many local students who would otherwise have been unable to obtain any formal education beyond high school at all. Usually the disabling factor is lack of money for the expenses of travel, maintenance, and college expenses at a four-year college or university away from the home town. Thus the community college provides the local student with a substantial financial advantage by virtue of his being able to continue to live under the parental roof in his home neighborhood. In varying circumstances, this may amount to average saving of perhaps $1,000 per year.

Then, too, public community colleges are in general low-fee or tuition-free institutions. A very good case could be made for making them all tuition free. However, there are currently existing student aid programs of nationwide scope and substantial size, such as Social Security benefits for children of widowed mothers or of disabled parents, up to the age of 22 if the child is enrolled in college; the Permanent G.I. Bill of 1966 for all who have served in the armed forces in wartime or in peacetime; and the "Educational Opportunity Grant" or scholarship provisions, as well as the work-study provisions of the Higher Education Act.

Each year there will be perhaps two million 18 year old high school graduates coming on who will not be qualified for Social Security benefits or for G.I. benefits. Many thousands of these will need financial aid even if college is in their home town and tuition-free. For this reason it is of great importance that the educational opportunity grant program and the work-study program should be expanded and updated.

Howard R. Bowen, in my opinion the wisest commentator on the financing of higher education, believes student loans should be used only in limited numbers of specially defined cases, such as where a student who is able to attend a community college or a state college, but wishes to take the gamble of borrowing for the added expenses of attending a high-prestige college or university.[1] For such cases, no vast national loan bank scheme would be necessary. Probably the present federal loan systems would be sufficient, if fully funded and actually operated.

In addition to the foregoing, the public community college is undoubtedly in a strategic position to receive student aid funds from local philanthropically-disposed individuals and organizations. In many instances it can develop so-called "cooperative education" whereby some students can earn maintenance and college expenses by part-time employment in cooperating local businesses and industries.

The aim of the community college should be to allow no local high school graduate to be compelled to forego further education solely because of lack of money.

FINANCING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

From one to three decades ago the prevailing idea was that a particular structure of governance and financial support for community colleges must come to prevail in all the states. Briefly, the college would be based on a local taxing district known as a junior college district, from which it would receive major fractions of its capital and operating funds. It would receive state aid amounting perhaps to half its capital outlays and roughly one-third of its annual operating expenses. In some instances as much as one-third of operating expenses came from student fees. Districts could be formed and colleges established only with the approval of a state administrative authority and by affirmative popular vote of the electors in the proposed district. Within limits set by state statute, governance was in the hands of local boards of trustees, usually elected.

This picture may now be characteristic of about half of the states having campuses at the junior college level, but even there it is undergoing change; and there is a substantial number of states where the idea never took root at all, and a number of others where it is a minority part of the total scene.

---

[1] Howard R. Bowen. The Finance of Higher Education. Berkeley: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1969. 35 pp.

A few states, mostly in the South, have long traditions of establishing and maintaining state junior colleges--in the same legal and financial relation to the state as the other state universities and colleges. Georgia currently has ten of these. Oklahoma has six. New York has six Agricultural and Technical Colleges which are state institutions, alongside the larger network of locally-based public community colleges.

In the same general category (of state junior colleges) are the dozen "regional community colleges" in Massachusetts, which began in 1959; the one Rhode Island Junior College; and the Connecticut regional community colleges, begun only in the late "Sixties", and now being developed alongside the smaller network of two-year branches of the state university. Tennessee is now rapidly building up a network of nine community colleges which are state institutions, as is also Alabama, with some seventeen state junior colleges in operation or in prospect.

Also in the same category are numerous community colleges in three other states which within the past ten years have changed from state-and-local support to full state support except for student fees. In 1963 Minnesota had eleven local public junior colleges, primarily supported locally but with substantial state aid. In 1969 it had 18 state junior colleges. More recently the state of Washington has accomplished the same change, and now has 22 state junior colleges. Colorado has a similar change in process. At last report about half of its junior colleges had become state junior colleges, and half were state-and-local.

Virginia, which had for some years followed the practice of developing two-year institutions as branch campuses of its principal state universities, in 1966 drastically changed that policy and determined to convert those campuses, and such others as were contemplated, to accomplish demographic coverage of the state, into state junior colleges, supported by state tax funds except for low student fees, and all governed by a power-laden State Board for Community Colleges empowered to appoint local advisory boards for each junior college. The local governmental subdivision is expected to supply land for the site, but all other capital outlays are to be paid by the state.

TOWARD FULL STATE SUPPORT

There is another manner in which the tax support of two-year institutions comes entirely or almost wholly from the state, in several states. That is where the two-year campuses are branches of a parent university, and their tax support is included within the budget of the parent institution. As is well known, this type of structure predominates in Wisconsin, Indiana, Ohio, Pennslyvania, South Carolina, Maine, Hawaii, and Alaska, as well as West Virginia and Kentucky. In Kentucky the fifteen outlying branches of the University of Kentucky are rather confusingly called "community colleges."

In Kentucky more than thirty years ago two bona fide local junior colleges got started in Ashland and Paducah, two sizeable towns at opposite ends of the state, with local support and local control, and they continue today, but they have become branches of the state university. In Kentucky, as in some other southern states, the cities and counties are relatively small, and it is often virtually impossible to draw community lines around an area

Large enough to justify a junior college, and locate the college at an appropriate central place and provide for its local tax support, all on local initiative. Hence there are not many locally-based community colleges in the South except in North Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, and Texas. The region has many state junior colleges and many two-year branches of state universities, as do also Wisconsin, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. In both of these latter two states there has been a recent start-up of locally-based community colleges, chiefly in a few large cities and their suburbs. In Ohio this growth has been slow. In Pennsylvania it appears to be somewhat more rapid; but in both states substantial numbers of state university branch campuses continue to flourish in larger numbers than the community colleges.

Lastly, in some twenty states where locally-based community colleges are well-established and well-supported with local taxation and with substantial state aid, the experience of the past ten years shows that the ratio of state aid to local tax support is generally increasing.

All the foregoing tends to indicate a strong trend toward full state tax support of public community colleges. For New York, this raises the question of whether the well-worn twenty-year-old formula of "Half the capital outlay from the state, and half from the county; one-third of the operating income from the state, one-third from the county, and one-third from the students as tuition fees" needs revision under present condiditons.

TO THE LARGER TAXING UNITS

It is quite obvious that long-standing economic and technological changes continue to force the exercise of the taxing power upward to the larger units of government, i.e., the states and the national government, in greater and greater proportion. This is because of the ascendancy of income over property as a measure of taxpaying ability. The property tax, which is almost the only practicable form of tax for small local subdivisions, has many shortcomings and needs much reform of its administration. The revenues from it are generally insufficient to operate and maintain essential local gevernmental services, to say nothing of public schools and colleges. This is why we have a vast and complicated system of state and federal grants-in-aid for highways, welfare, public schools, colleges and universities, and many other indispensable public services.

It seems quite clear that the contributions of the states must continue to increase proportionally, and that eventually the share of the federal government must grow at a rate much more rapidly than those of the states. The federal government currently collects two-thirds of all tax revenues; and most of this is accomplished through the graduated income tax, administered by the most efficient tax-collecting agency in the world. It is not possible to turn back the clock and push more of the exercise of the taxing power downward to the local units; nor is it thinkable to neglect or reduce the support of the essential public services, including education at all levels. This makes increased state support, and vastly increased federal support, inevitable.

Therefore continuation and broadening of federal subsidies to public junior colleges through the Higher Education Facilities Act is desirable. Likewise through all the federal student aid schemes already mentioned. The junior colleges do not benefit much from the vast federal program of grants and contracts for research. All types of subsidies just mentioned are categorical; that is, they are for narrowly specified purposes, and this unavoidably means that they fragment the autonomy of the institution, and tend to shape the college or university ultimately in accord with decisions made in Washington rather than at home.

Nevertheless these programs should be maintained and expanded. In addition, another largely new channel of federal support for all reputable institutions of higher education should be initiated at once: noncategorical annual grants direct from the federal Treasury to each institution, to be used at its own discretion to pay a minor fraction of its general annual operating expenses. The apportionment should be on the basis of some simple formula such as is now used by New York State in its current subsidies to nonsectarian private colleges.

The general pattern of this plan has already been approved and advocated by many of the large national higher education associations. It would tend to safeguard some measure of integrity and self-determination for each institution as against incursions by the federal government and by the state governments. It would provide operating funds--presumably increasing year by year with the expansion of higher education--which all types of universities and colleges must obtain to meet their responsibilities.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND STUDENT AID

On the current national scene there is some argument as to whether the greatly augmented tax support of higher education should be aid to the students as against aid to the institutions. Some private college people apparently believe the competitive position of the private colleges would be greatly improved if tax-derived grants sufficient to cover tuition fees were made available to all or nearly all students. The fact is that no institution can gain in large measure or for long from tax-supported scholarships unless they are accompanied by substantial tax-supported "cost of education grants" direct to the institution itself. Both institutional support and student aids should be used concurrently, and neither should drive out the other.

The idea that all tax support should go to students and none to institutions is a fantasy not far removed from the advocacy, chiefly among Ivy League economists, of a huge all-inclusive nationwide student loan system under which all students beyond high school would be encouraged to borrow sums sufficient to cover all college expenses, including maintenance and incidentals as well as student fees. The loans would be for periods variously estimated as 30 years, 40 years, or life, and would be amortized by annual payments of a fixed percentage of the borrower's income per $1,000 borrowed, paid to the Internal Revenue Service along with the annual federal income tax return.

Various partly-defined forms of this scheme are known by such saccharine names as Educational Opportunity Bank (the Zacharias plan), and National Youth Endowment. Skipping over the myriad unanswered questions and undetermined features of this idea, one can go right to the bottom of it and notice that in basic theory it points toward a total reversal of the long-developed impression that higher education is a public responsibility, and toward the complete ascendancy of the archaic idea that higher education is exclusively a private consumer's good--a private indulgence to be bought and paid for in the open market, and to be entirely at the private expense of the student. In other words, higher education would become dependent for its sustenance upon "user fees."

In my opinion it grows out of a gross misconception of what higher education really is and what it is for, as well as a complete misreading of the plainly visible trends in the expansion and support of higher education in the United States today. Unless it were surrounded by drastic safeguards that have never been made public, so far as my knowledge goes, the scheme would lead ultimately to the destruction of our magnificent system of tax-supported low-tuition higher education, and would substitute for it a private-purchase system in which the whole cost would be assumed by the student, in the form of payments deferred over the whole period of his working life. I restrain myself from saying more, in order to return to the role of the fifty states in junior college financing.

The one-third--one-third--one-third formula used in New York State, I have been told, was arrived at in a rather random fashion; but it was a reasonably generous and reasonably equitable arrangement for its time (the late nineteen forties). It has not only stood for more than twenty years, but has influenced other states, particularly Maryland, where the idea was formally written into a state statute of 1965. By now there are so many two-year institutions in many states that are wholly supported by state funds without tax contributions from any local subdivision that New York's state contribution looks small. The difficulties experienced by the cities and other local subdivisions have made a larger state contribution to junior college operating income essential.

But how can this be done? In half of the states, whose total of state and local tax collections per year per $1,000 of personal income is below the average among the fifty states, a good answer would seem to be simply to update the state revenue system to make it more productive. But in 1968 the average among the states was $134.51. The highest state was North Dakota with $190.96. The lowest was Illinois, with $105.50. New York ranked tenth with $158.31. One might say, then, that New York had a state revenue system of well above average productivity, and that there might be reasonable limits of immediate improvement in that respect.

But there is another and a better answer. Generally running a "tight ship" and keeping its fiscal affairs in good order while providing superior public services in many fields, New York State, after a century of comparative neglect of public higher education, has made spectacular increases in tax support of higher education since 1960. Scarcely another state has shown more rapid gains over ten years. If this splendid progress is to continue (and I believe it will continue), there is no escaping the fact that a little further reordering of priorities, to place public higher education in a more advantageous position among other state services, must logically be expected to occur.

In 1968 New York was investing $26.72 per citizen in the operating expenses of higher education, and ranking only twenty-fifty by that measure, after eight years of rapid progress. The ratio of that investment to total personal income was 0.65, ranking forty-fifth among the states. In brief, the figures of 1968 indicate some leeway for improving the state revenue system and clear need of a higher priority for public higher education within the limits of the total state resources. Either or both of these means will be necessary to continuing improved state tax support of the State University complex, of the growing community college network, and of the City University of New York--all of which are essential.

My prescriptions are not revolutionary innovations. They are, instead, accelerations of long-standing trends, some of which are not widely understood:

(1) Expand federal and state programs of student aid, especially scholarships for low-income persons and work-study programs.

(2) Increase the states' share in the support of community colleges.

(3) Look to constant improvement of state revenue systems.

(4) Give higher education a higher priority among the other functions of state governments.

(5) Maintain and expand existing programs of federal support for higher education, and add annual federal grants to all reputable universities, colleges, and junior colleges, public and private, on some simple formula basis, to cover a fraction of their regular operating expenses, to be expended entirely at their own discretion.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

DR. ALDINGTON: What about the old-fashioned notion that you develop responsibility among the students by giving them the chance to respond with tuition payment? We owe some of that to the local communities' financial support. I have always admired New York State's Community College law because it seems to me that while there are many problems, it puts the teeth where they should be in some cases. If the local people try doing something that gets the support of the local people, then maybe we don't need the other support.

DR. CHAMBERS: Well, I think I recognize what you are saying. First in the case of the student there is a view that after he reaches 18, he shouldn't have to pay for it, partially. And second, the same could be said for the local community. If you want active support and local involvement on the part of the community, maybe you would stand a better chance of getting it, if everybody participated. I recognize that argument. I do think, however, that the economic trends I mentioned in the field of taxation are making this approach more and more difficult. I think also we may have to rely on other means of getting local citizen involvement and student involvement rather than requiring the community and the student to pay part of the cost. Although it would serve the purpose that we had in mind, I wouldn't want to move into a smaller obligation.

PROF. HANSON: I'm against tokenism there, too. I don't think a third is bad.

DR. CHAMBERS: Well, maybe not; I don't want to be doing this in a dogmatic way.

MR. ROBBINS: One problem on this is that the ability of the local community to contribute is more and more dependent on the property tax which already is heavily pressed to provide greater services. The local community doesn't have any form of securing funds based on ability such as an income tax.

PROF. HANSON: I am making the point that income from property tax is under horrible pressures from many sources, and it's poor form to have to rely on community sacrifice. It's also discriminatory

DR. CHAMBERS: You have number of trends all going on at once, and it's very hard to observe all the them at one time. I think you would probably agree with me that there is a trend in progress right now for the entire expense of welfare programs to be left up to the federal government. It ultimately could become a program totally supported by federal funds.

DR. ALDINGTON: I'm curious to know if the community colleges, which serve several communities and are state supported rather than locally, whether the persons in that community feel as if that college is theirs. I'm sure that at the Mohawk Valley Community College one of the important pluses is we can honestly say to the community that the college is theirs.

DR. CHAMBERS: The only way I can comment on that might be obliquely. For example, in Kentucky and Tennessee, two adjacent states, the counties are small and most of the towns are so small that you don't have as easy a possibility of establishing a community college as you do in New York State. It's very hard to take four or five little counties with four or five villages in them and depend on those communities to get the tax levy voted and get the location of a community college campus fixed. The problem of establishing a college is made more difficult. It appears that as soon as they establish a community college down there, they immediately get the anticipated attendance just the same as you do in New York.

DR. COLLINS: I'd like to comment more on the substance of your ideas on financing. I have written a junior and higher college monograph called "Financing a Junior College Proposal" which will be distributed shortly. The thing that prompted me to look into this and to write about it was a study done by Hanson and Vicerow. It was a study of the financing of higher education in California and incorporated into it is also a study in Wisconsin. The substance of the Hanson-Vicerow study indicated that any time you have the so-called "free higher education" which is heavily based upon either property tax or sales tax or any of the other forms of regressive taxes the poor really subsidize the rich to go on to college.

Theyactually found in California and Wisconsin that the students going to the university received a public subsidy which amounted to the difference between what they had to pay and what it actually cost to educate the student, in the neighborhood of $2,000. Those who went into the state colleges got a public subsidy somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,500, and those going to the community colleges got a public subsidy somewhere in the neighborhood of $800. Those going to no college, namely, the lower lower class get a public subsidy of zilch.

DR. CHAMBERS: That's where I'd like to come in because my contention is that the existence of this vast and varied system of public higher education is a real substantial benefit to every living citizen, regardless of age or sex or economic circumstances. Is not the baby who was born yesterday, and by virtue of advanced medical science has a 95 percent chance to survive through his first year, is he not the beneficiary of higher education?

DR. COLLINS: Admitted, and my contention would be not only that everyone should benefit from this in an indirect way, through the contributions of medicine and so forth, but should also be able to benefit directly. But to carry on the analysis of Hanson and Vicerow; they found that family income of the people going to the University averages $12,00 a year; those going to the state colleges had a lower average of $10,000; those going to the community colleges had a lower average of $8,000 and those not sending their children to school had even less. In essence, this indicates that the poor subsidize the rich, and in California this is becoming very evident. They're increasing the tuition in the universities and state colleges, and they're going to increase the tax revenues largely by the sales tax. This is a Reagan move, and I hope most of you have governors who don't operate in the same fashion as our Reagan, but nonetheless, this is not an unusual picture.

Well, I think that you could set up a system of loans that would be completely open to all people. The repayment would begin when they reached a level of affluence which in turn could be guaranteed by means of an insurance system not unlike the G.I. insurance system. This would assure the loan system becoming a revolving loan system. It's a very complex thing and maybe I really shouldn't have brought it up. You can take a look at the monograph when it comes out, but

I would like to underline the point. We speak of free education, but unless you start looking and seeing just what we mean by free education, and who is actually paying for the people who are going to go free, then you haven't seen the full picture.

DR. CHAMBERS: Well, I'm glad you did bring it up because it is a matter in one form or another that has received a good deal of discussion within the past two years. Some people on both sides of the issues feel emotionally outraged by it.

I attended a conference of this kind in Washington, D.C. about two weeks ago held by the American College Testing Program where they had about 40 leading persons including my much admired friend from Pomona, Dr. Howard Bowen and also Alice Rivlin who is one of the most eminent of economists nowadays. Bowen's position was that loans should be used for a rather narrowly defined type of student. Somewhat to my surprise, Alice Rivlin said that she believed that Zacharias had abandoned the idea of an all inclusive, omnibus, nationwide system that would involve everybody, and had come to a position somewhat like Bowen's.

MR. KLEGMAN: When two-year colleges have been added to the state financial structure have the two-year colleges been able to pursue more easily all the programs they wished to under the former system?

DR. CHAMBERS: I don't know too much about it, but I'll answer it obliquely. Six years ago Minnesota had eleven locally based junior colleges and now it has eighteen state junior colleges. I can't say just how diversified their programs are, but I can say their number has increased by 50 percent and their enrollment has increased by more than that. At least it's a growing enterprise.

MR. KLEGMAN: Yes, we wouldn't know if the growth might have been more accelerated under the former system. It just might be inevitable because the students are there. I go back to the local question; does the little community no longer think of it as their college? We nurture our own progress through community involvement, through local industrial involvement, by saying we are your community college. While we derive our revenues from students, about 20 percent from the county and state, shared on a 50-50 basis over and above student revenue, or whether you term it tuition and capital, 30-40 from federal, state and county, I wonder whether we could do better with all the colleges. Right now, as Dr. Collins has said, we scramble for the few bucks available and the Board of Higher Education sits in judgment as to whether they are going to i give this college a million or, this one which is just starting, the two million; some get nothing one year and it's hard to plan on that basis. There is no continuity but maybe, if it's state, completely state supported and controlled, we maybe giving up a little but maybe getting more in things we want.

DR. CHAMBERS: I'm very wary of too much state control. I do hope that the science of state planning will develop to a point where we won't be constantly in hot water wondering whether we'll get any money next year. I do have some hope that the science of planning of state's affairs will improve very rapidly.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND THE COLLEGE STUDENT

William F. McHugh

Mr. McHugh, now Special Counsel for Employment Relations, State University of New York, has been a source of legal help for a number of years to the state's two-year colleges on a broad range of problems. He completed his B.A. degree at Colgate University, and the J.D. degree from Union University-Albany Law School. Before assuming his present position, Mr. McHugh was associate Counsel at SUNY, and formerly was assistant Counsel at Cornell University. He has taught graduate courses on legal problems of public and private higher educational institutions at the School of Education, SUNY-Albany. Mr. McHugh's professional responsibilities include the chairmanship of the Committee on Labor Relations in Higher Education for the National Association of College and University Attorneys.

Collective bargaining is a collective process, adversary in nature, which is designed to resolve conflict. A common definition is contained in Section 8(d) of the National Labor Relations Act:

> For the purposes of this section, to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representatives of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours , and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract incorporating any agreement reached, if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession.

Collective bargaining includes two fundamental elements. One is the act of negotiation...the actual bargaining sessions themselves. The second element is the more informal relationship created during the implementation of the contract after it is negotiated, in other words, faculty[1] relations under the contract. The latter characteristically involves problem oriented consultation between the parties and also administration of the contract's grievance system. Thus, collective bargaining as the term is used here means not only the actual collective negotiation sessions but also the complicated and subtle relationships that develop as the parties live under the contract.

The advent of collective bargaining by faculty and other professionals is one of the newest, if not the most curious phenomenons in professional relations in higher education. Its rapid beginning in some of the nation's community colleges suggests a spread of epidemic proportions to other institutions across the land. More than half of the community colleges in Michigan have adopted this method of conflict resolution since 1966. New York's Taylor Law authorized collective bargaining by public employees in the fall of 1967. Only two years later there were 16 negotiated contracts out of 30 community colleges outside New York City. In Illinois, Chicago's Junior College system operates under a system-wide collective bargaining agreement for those colleges.

---

[1] In this paper the term "faculty" means faculty in the classic sense (academic rank) or means both academic rank and non-teaching professionals such as student counselors, instructional resource, etc. This is consistent with variations in unit determinations to date.

Nor is this phenomenon restricted to community colleges. The City University of New York with thirteen institutions under its jurisdiction has negotiated two collective bargaining agreements with its full-time and part-time professionals. Seven of these institutions are four year liberal arts institutions.[2] New York's Public Employment Relations Board has ordered a representation election in New York's educational giant, the State University of New York. SUNY has twenty-six campuses composed of agricultural and technical colleges, two-year community colleges, specialized colleges, medical centers, liberal arts colleges, and university centers. The unit determination is being contested in the courts at this time. In New Jersey collective negotiations are presently under way in its higher educational system. The Rutgers faculty represented by the AAUP are currently engaged in collective bargaining with Rutgers University. Central Michigan University, another four year institution, has just completed a contract with its faculty. The faculty of Oakland University in Michigan has filed a petition for certification. In Massachusetts, Boston State College is currently engaged in negotiations leading to its first contract. Just this month a representation election was conducted in St. John's University in New York City which was won by the independent faculty association. Negotiations will commence soon.

In a recent survey[3] of 60,447 faculty (26.9 percent full professors, 22.1 percent associate professors, 28.8 percent assistant professors, and 13.8 percent instructors) the following statement was submitted: "Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university." The results are noteworthy: 19.1 percent agreed strongly, 23.5 percent agreed with reservation, 33.7 percent disagreed with reservation, 20.4 percent disagreed strongly...thus 54.1 percent disagreed.

Since there is a dearth of experience in this new field, it is difficult to draw solid conclusions on collective bargaining in higher education. The present stage of development is primarily one of identifying the problems and giving careful thought to the uses and limitations of the bargaining process in higher education. In regard to identifying problems there is one issue which has been given too little attention: the place of the student in collective bargaining. Perhaps this is because, with some minor exceptions which will be disucssed later, experience to date has indicated little disposition on the part of students to become involved in the process. Accordingly, observations concerning the students' place in all of this is pure speculation.

---

[2] For a comprehensive report on the impact of the Taylor Law on New York's public higher education institutions see: William F. McHugh "Collective Negotiations in Public Higher Education" College and University Business December 1969, p.41.

[3] These figures are from an unpublished survey conducted as part of a project of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education...part of the survey way reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, April 6, 1970.

This presentation will be limited to two fundamental questions. Will students become involved in collective bargaining? How is student involvement in the collective bargaining process likely to take place?

WILL STUDENTS BECOME INVOLVED IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING?

Yes, it is reasonable to assume that students will become substantially involved. There are two fundamental reasons for this conclusion which bear elaboration. First, faculty will seek to introduce into the bargaining process matters which will either directly or indirectly affect the self-interest of the students. Experience so far in higher education suggests that the scope of collective negotiations with faculty will cover a wide variety of matters. Faculty are bringing to the collective negotiation process matters that go far beyond the industrial and public employment sector concept of terms and conditions of employment, typically salaries and fringe benefits. There can be no doubt that professionals will be negotiating for salaries and fringe benefits; the City University of New York contract makes this abudantly clear. But if recently negotiated contracts are bellwethers, it is equally clear that faculty are introducing matters that include academic and policy matters...institutional policies. Contracts in both the New York community colleges and in other higher educational institutions so indicate. Moreover, formal procedures which insure appropriate consultation and opportunities for the professional staff to present ideas and attitudes to the governing boards or otherrr sources of authority are appearing in contracts.[4] This is logical because of the long-held view in American higher education, public and private, that faculty should have wide discretion in the conduct of their professional activities. This tradition is not a shibboleth but a requirement for high-level achievement. It is reasoned that faculty should have some form of "shared authority" or participation in the formulation of the policies and rules that govern the performance of their duties...participation in the governance of the institution itself. Thus faculty-university relationships cannot adhere to traditional management concepts of supervisor--subordinate relationships characteristic of industrial and public employment relations.

Accordingly, a recent study on faculty governance indicates that economic factors per se have not been a controlling consideration in faculty unrest.[5] There are those who look upon the collective bargaining process as a device for achieving or maintining shared authority;[6] authority which concerns a variety of professional issues and institutional policies.[7]

---

[4] For an example of this see Articles I, V, XXII of the September 1969 agreement between City University of New York and the Legislative Conference (hereinafter "CUNY contract").

[5] American Association for Higher Education, "Faculty Participation in Academic Governance" (1967), p.1, 9-13.

[6] Id. p.2, 63

[7] Id. p.1, 14-26

This may include: economic matters ranging from the total resources available to the institution to the compensation of particular individuals; public questions that affect the role and function of the institution; procedures for faculty representation in campus governance.

A more recent expression of this is contained in the AAUP October 1969 policy recognizing the "significant role which collective bargaining may play in bringing agreement between faculty and administration on economic and academic issues"[8] (emphasis mine). The AAUP policy goes on to say that the negotiation of a collective agreement may "provide for the eventual establishment of necessary instruments of shared authority."[9] An informal fall-1969 survey of sixteen New York community college contracts, which identified subject matters covered in the aggregate contracts, showed 106 different items which included: work load, teaching assignments, seniority rights, class size, contacts hours, faculty rank ratios, curriculum, faculty student ratios, prior consultation on educational policy and budget matters. Many of these appear in the City University contract as well.

It is clear to me that collective negotiations with faculty will include a wide variety of issues. Some of the issues will directly affect the self-interest of students and in which they will seek a stake. It remains to be seen whether or not the collective bargaining process as now conceived can be a constructive factor in academic governance.

Parenthetically, the employee unit determinations that have developed thus far in the majority of the community colleges in New York and Michigan, City University, State University, and the New Jersey system, all group the academic rank faculty with combinations of non-teaching professionals such as librarians, student personnel counselors, and instructional resource persons. Aside from the other implications of this, it can be expected that the professional interests of these groups will also be introduced into the bargaining process.

The second reason which supports the conclusion that students will become involved in the bargaining process is more obvious than that just described. The current state of student-university relations clearly indicates active participation by students in matters heretofore the prerogative of the faculty and also participation in institutional policy matters. One has only to examine what has takenplace in student-university relationships over the past half decade or so. A general highlight will illustrate. It is clear in many universities and colleges that students how have representation on faculty governing bodies such as faculty senates or councils. This representation varies in scope and character. In some cases the students are permitted to vote, in others they are not. But it is safe to generalize that in almost all cases where "mixed" senates are beginning to emerge as governance mechanisms on university campuses that students are represented. At some institutions students are even sitting on department promotion, appointment, and curriculum committees. In some of these cases they have votes and in other cases their role is only advisory. It is commonplace for students to be actively involved in, indeed control, revisions of student disciplinary systems. Somewhat less common, but not unusual, is student participation in developing disciplinary procedures affecting non-students. An example would be a campus-wide judicial system applying to all persons in the academic community, including faculty. It is a fact of academic life today that any task force established by the University has some kind of student representation. These commissions, task forces, or committees cover a variety of matters. They characteristically include such things as site selection for new buildings, the selection of university administrative staff, programs for the disadvantaged, relationships with the surrounding urban community, parking problems, and an endless variety of other matters.

---

[8] AAUP Bulletin, Winter 1969 - "Policy on Representation of Economic and Professional Interests." Paragraph I.B.

[9] Id.

If it is true that faculty and non-teaching professionals will introduce into the bargaining process matters concerning institutional policy and the self-interest of students, and if it is equally true that students are actively participating in matters concerning institutional policy and the self-interest of faculty, then it seems inescapable that students will eventually become involved in the bargaining process at those institutions where it is used.

HOW WILL STUDENT INVOLVEMENT IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING TAKE PLACE?

One may think of student participation in the bargaining process in three ways: as a principal, as an interested third party involved in some way in the negotiations, and finally in post contract relationships.

Students using the first method of participating as a principal will organize, elect a bargaining agent and negotiate a contract. One of the problems here is whether or not the students in question have the legal authorization to organize and negotiate. In the main, labor relations statutes which authorize collective bargaining require employment status. However, even where such a right does not exist an institution, as Wisconsin did, may choose to recognize the student group or permit an election. Moreover, seeking to participate as a principal in bargaining requires certain elements to work. For one thing, there must be a community of interest based upon some defined relationship with the employer among the student group seeking to negotiate. Typically, this is a common interest in working conditions, financial betterment, and other readily indentifiable self-interest factors. It requires a substantial degree of ordered organization, group discipline, competent leadership, expertise, and most important, money. A predominantly undergraduate student body reflecting a spectrum of diverse and conflicting interests would undoubtedly not be enchanted by nor adopt the long-term styles necessary to participation as a principal. Participatory democracy, i.e. clear peer unanimity on the lowest common denominator issues, is ill-fitted to the realities of employee organization dynamics. Likewise, it is unlikely that a community college student body, predominantly commuter, would embrace it.

Not so with graduate students such as teaching assistants. Teaching assistants enjoy a quasi-employment status, have a community of interest in bread and butter working conditions...salaries, health plans, work load, etc. They also have a common interest in facets of the educational policy effecting their activities. It is reasonable to expect in certain situations that teaching assistants, research assistants, medical interns (medical center house staff) and other classes of graduate students in large universities and/or professional centers will elect a bargaining agent and negotiate a contract. This is more than speculation. At Wisconsin, the teaching assistants elected a bargaining agent, the Teaching Assistant Association (TAA), and negotiated with the administration. Bargaining demands included: length of appointment, job security, work load, class size, evaluation of performance, access to employee files, grievance procedures and health plans.[10] An impasse arose and the TAA called a strike. The impasse was over the teaching assistant's demand "that the university accept the principle that students and teaching assistants be given a portion of direct decision-making power over educational issues such as course creation and modification, pedagogical techniques, course structure, and text book selection."[11] The university was only willing to bargain about decision making mechanisms to assure participation of teaching assistants and students in educational policy.[12] The university intimated that faculty control could not be superseded by that of the teaching assistants. Negotiations were resumed in April 1970 and an agreement negotiated.

The second way students might become involved in the negotiation process is in their capacity as interested third parties but not as principals. The way this will be done will depend upon the circumstances, issues, and the type of students concerned.

In one case an educational corporation, controlled by the college and formed for the purpose of providing auxiliary services to the college, was engaged in negotiations under the New York State Labor Relations Act with the food service employees of that corporation. Students actually sat on the administration's negotiating team for the entire proceeding. In this particular situation the students had a vested interest in the food service. Any negotiated settlement was also dependent upon increasing the board fees of the students. In this case the interests of the students were pretty well limited and related to a pure economic matter in which the students had the primary stake.

In more complex negotiations with faculty it would likely prove impractical to have students participate on negotiating teams through the entire negotiations, especially where multi-campus systems or large multi-purpose university centers are concerned. Besides, on which side of the table would the students sit? Clearly, the perceived self-interest of students will vary with the issues and circumstances especially where undergraduates are concerned. Moreover, there is a certain necessary ritual in negotiations with its wish-book demands, endless discussion, and tactical hysterics. But the heart of negotiations require candid communications and discussions of institutional problems, a high degree of confidentiality, a sensitivity to the internal dynamics of the bargaining agent and the administration's political limitations in the case of a public institution. It requires a mutual commitment to reason and compromise. It requires a fine sense of timing. The presence of students throughout negotiations but with only a limited self-interest in the negotiations could seriously impair, if not destroy the process.

---

[10] THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, March 30, 1970, p.3

[11] Id.

[12] Id.

A more realistic possibility will be the utilization of students on resource sub-committees which may be created during the negotiation sessions for the purpose of making studies, developing facts, and assessing attitudes and opinions on those issues clearly relevant to students. Circumstances may warrant standing sub-committees upon which students participate.

Many state labor statutes provide for mediation and fact-finding to resolve impasses during negotiations. It is possible that students will seek to present their views on certain relevant issues during the course of fact-finding or arbitration proceedings.

The negotiated contract itself may provide for student participation where post contract procedures or committees are created to resolve a particular problem or to make a study. The City University of New York's contract suggests this possibility with respect to the provision on housing.[13] This suggests the third way, and perhaps the most practical, by which students will participate in the bargaining process...during the post-contract or implementing stage. This permits participation in the broader relationships between faculty and the institution in much the same way students presently do. Relationships at this point are more problem oriented and therefore afford the opportunity to isolate issues of relevance to students. It affords greater flexibility for a variety of students and student organizations to participate. It requires less time, energy and money. It is in a problem oriented consultative relationship that undergraduate student participation is likely to be productive. Such things as parking problems, experimental ETV programs and off-campus study programs might be examples of post-contract matters in which students could participate under the third alternative. Hopefully this will strengthen the bargaining process by providing a continuous interchange with those who will undoubtedly be affected by it.

CONCLUSION

Two trends in higher education suggest that students will become involved in the collective bargaining process. One trend indicates that faculty are introducing into the bargaining process a wide range of matters relating to institutional governance and policies which affect the self-interest of students. A parallel trend clearly indicates that students are becoming more increasingly involved in matters directly affecting faculty and institutional policies.

---

[13] CUNY contract, Article XXII

Students are likely to participate in the bargaining process in three ways. The first is as a negotiating principal seeking to negotiate a contract. Graduate students such as teaching assistants are examples. The second way is by participating on advisory resource committees during the negotiations between faculty and the university. Both graduate and undergraduates may become involved under this alternative. The third way is in an advisory role in the post-contract stage when problem oriented consultative procedures are common. The author feels the third method is likely to prove more productive than the second in the case of undergraduate students.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

MR. KLEGMAN: I have two questions for you. You emphasized the student unit. I thoughtthe contract, at least in New Jersey--that under this law there must be an employer-employee relationship before you have a justifiable basis for a contract. The second question: are there some items that are bargainable and arbitratable and some that are not under the contract? For example, we want an open admissions policy, the faculty says, "Just a minute, you know, you're going to load us and we're going to have difficulty and problems and so forth." Is this the type of item that becomes a bargainable issue? What's the relationship of that to the contract?

MR. MCHUGH: Well, as to your first question, I tried to make clear at the very outset that in terms of actually establishing a student labor union, you have the threshold legal question of whether or not the students are employees. Now, in the state university some are employees. Not all students, but graduate students who are teaching assistants or research assistants are employees. I'm sure this is also true of some private universities and medical centers in New York. But a student in the classic sense is not a employee, for example, a typical undergraduate student. Therefore, under most state labor statutes he has no legal right to collectively bargain. Parenthetically, he doesn't have a legal right to take over buildings, he doesn't have a legal right to be on tenure and promotion committees either.

I can see graduate students such as teaching or research assistants forming a full blown labor organization and seeking to collectively bargain on salaries, work rules, medical benefits, etc., as in Wisconsin this year. Bear in mind many of these students are married and have families; economic matters can be paramount. However, I don't see the classic undergraduate students as coming in as a separate distinct employee organization. But I see the possibility of their becoming involved in some way, such as being on working committees during the bargaining process itself. For example, if you got into an open admissions question, I could see where the black student confederation in your system would come in and say, "Look, here's your major problem with your disadvantaged program. We're not getting enough counseling or preparation before we can get on campus." Or they might say: "These faculty members are never around and now they are asking you for more money for these programs. What are they going to do with it? We have some things to say now... You get the picture." They may be brought--they may be engineered--right in it as a technical maneuver by one of the parties because there's not going to be any give on this point. Thus, if you have factfinding or advisory arbitration in your state, someone is going to want the support of the black students because these are the students who are affected directly by this program. There are other obvious reasons, it also may have some larger range political implications in terms of your black interest groups in New Jersey. If you get the black student organizations behind you at an early point, you know, you're home free.

Now your second question as to scope of negotiation: are you even going to bargain on it--on open admissions--the type and character of programs for the disadvantaged traditional position might be, it seems to me, that admissions policy and such programs are not even bargainable.

You have to go back to the law on this. One of the problems with New York's Taylor Law is that there is no attempt to define scope of negotiations. Management must negotiate "in good faith" on terms and conditions of employment. It is the clear policy in New York to keep this concept of scope of negotiations flexible and to let it develop on a case by case basis.

MR. KLEGMAN: Yes, it will take a decision each time to define whether or not it falls within the contract? Now, in the Federal Executive Order, for example, 11491, there is some attempt as there was under 1098 and 1099.to limit the scope of negotiation. And in certain states, for example, only certain items are even negotiable by law. That's not true in our state. I don't believe it's true in yours.

That's why I raised the parallel because I'm familiar with the federal statute too.

MR. MCHUGH: What you've go to do is sit down and say: "We're not even going to negotiate that." Hopefully, in the bargaining process you can develop what is negotiable and what isn't.

QUESTION: Has it been really established now what the definitions of employer and employee are as they relate to academic setting?

MR. MCHUGH: Traditionally under the National Labor Relations Act, and I think Michigan has this provision in its act, management usually ties in with some kind of a supervisory responsibility. In other words, those acts try to define management as a person who has supervision over other people. That generally is one of the typical distinctions. Another is a person who is privy to the policy decision. This question of who is management in the industrial sector doesn't raise difficult problems as a general proposition. When you get into higher education, there is the hairy question of traditional professional relationship of a faculty with the university. Obviously faculty are not really supervised by management. Also, faculty often become involved in the educational decision-making process. No question about it, this may start right at the department level and move right on up to the very top. In fact, the faculty are in many institutions deeply involved in the selection of the president. You can imagine the union being directly involved in the selection of the president of a General Motors. It's patently ridiculous.

In the educational sphere, this matter of management tends to be a pretty difficult question. I must say that you have to be almost arbitrary in some respects in establishing who should be excluded from the employee unit because they are management. I think generally the cutoff would certainly be at the dean level.

PROF. HANSON: I wondered about department chairman.

MR. MCHUGH: Now, when you get into department chairmen, I think the trend so far in the unit determinations is for the department chairmen to be in the employee unit and not management. You take the title of "dean" for example, what in heaven's name does it mean? A dean at one type of campus may have real management functions.

But to get back to this management. A dean in a university center might have less responsibility, albeit a larger budget and more people than a dean in a four-year college. A division chairman in a community college might have responsibilities akin to a department chairman in a university center so that really the words "dean" or "department chairman" do not mean anything except as it's applied to a specific institution. This is one of the problems you have in a large sprawling multi-campus university such as we have in New York.

Now, what we have done in the State University is that all deans, assistant deans, associate deans, are management. All V-P's at the campuses and some directors are also at the statewide level, your vice-chancellors and associate vice-chancellors, counsels and personnel administrators are considered management. In a larger sense the subject becomes even more complicated in the public sector because no one has the kind of clear-cut authority in the public sector you have in the industrial or private. One could argue that the dean at a university center has no binding authority, nor the academic vice president, nor the president--nor the vice chancellor of finance, nor the state division of the budget. Thus only the legislature has ultimate authority. Obviously, as you move up the line, the complexity and the extent of authority in decision-making increases so what you are really talking about is finding the party who has the authority to make "effective recommendations." That's the public employer. In this case this would be the executive branch of government: the Division of the Budget, the Office of Employment Relations and the University Trustees through the central university administration, as the logical bodies to represent the executive and negotiate with faculty.

Now, as you move out of fiscal matters and into academic matters, the authority becomes dispersed and is substantially at the lower levels. That's why it's very difficult to sit down in a collective bargaining session on a university system basis and to really try to make collective negotiations work. Take the simple thing of hiring, firing, and promotions. That's essentially a local matter and it often goes right down to the department chairman. That's completely different in the public sector and is certainly different in the industrial sector. In industry, the director of personnel has the authority to hire. Many times decisions to hire and fire are made at a fairly high level. That's certainly not true when you get into the academic world. You have all kinds of crazy ways of hiring and promoting, assuming the position and salary range is established. It's a peculiar kind of professional witch dance ritual that usually begins in the department itself and then may spread to the dean and/or academic V-P. It may even involve different schools. So a joint appointment in the school of education and the school of business administration might involve four departments, i.e., the department of economics, organizational theory, educational administration and the department of higher education. You end up with four departments involved and a complex of people touching base with a thousand other people. Finally the guy is hired and "management" in the traditional industrial sense doesn't have a thing to do with it. This takes place almost entirely at the departmental level and almost always at the campus level.

I prefer to keep the bargaining issues as narrow as possible; the effort at bargaining should be to develop flexible means for resolving conflict where cooperation is emphasized. The bargaining process can be very constructive if properly handled. There are some things about the process which are appealing to me. For one thing it requires a certain amount of organizational discipline which characteristically faculties don't have in emerging institutions. They have had it in the traditional and older institutions. In stabilized institutions there is a rapport and a communications system where a faculty can move and make decisions effectively. But in institutions just beginning to develop and build traditions there is a period of upheaval. The traditional lines of governance and means for faculty participation are in a state of change. In times of undue stress the deliverative systems break down. Collective negotiation as a means for resolving conflict requires a certain amount of employee organizational discipline. It provides an opportunity for some organization with legal clout to assume vigorous responsibility. It will require among faculty some substantial measure of responsibility for resolving conflict among interest groups within their own bodies. If there is exclusive representation the organization will have to sit down and listen to the doctors, to the activists, to the undergraduate faculties, the university center faculties, and the agricultural and technical colleges. Finally, they are going to have to reconcile institutional differences.

If they are going to be responsible, they are going to have to say, look, we can't go in with eight tons of demands this year. That is what is realistic, this is what we are going to shoot for, and so, you fellows here, and you fellows there, are going to have to hold your demands back.

The argument has been made that this is democratization at its worst. What is going to happen is that the majority is going to win. The organization will be attentive only to the masses and hence the mediocre. Professionalism is not democratic and excellence discriminates and is for the few. A first class university, when you are talking faculty, is aristocratic. The few control the many. It is not a democratic institution at all. Few understand the argument.

Well, this is part of the group and organizational dynamics that the faculty and the other professionals are going to have to consider. I think management's so-called objective should be to avoid doing something that tends to foster instability within the employee organization itself. Resolving instability will be a prime concern of the first employee organization.

QUESTION: I wanted to ask in terms of scope, based on what has happened so far, do you think the scope will get involved in such things as classification rather than strictly salaries.

MR. MCHUGH: I don't know. There is going to have to be some system for rewarding superstars. There will be some attempt to follow the pattern on the part of the organizations that are established in the City University. I think it is essential to make some accommodation to the merit system.

A TRUSTEE'S VIEW

Joseph Klegman

Mr. Klegman is now Director of the New York Postal Data Center with responsibility for financial managment services for the 4,000 post offices in Northeast United States. He is a graduate of a two-year college, Middlesex Junior College, received a degree from Rutgers University, and a Masters degree from the Graduate School of Business of New York University. He helped lead a citizens effort to found Middlesex County College in 1964 and has been a trustee of the college since then. Active as a professional and teacher in management circles, he also serves on various study groups, such as the Federal Government's Two-Year College/Federal Agency Relationship Program of which he is coordinator. Colonel Klegman (Active Air Force Reserve) is a pilot and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross.

In the recent past, commencement speakers exhorted graduates to go out and set the world on fire. Today, it takes the police and national guard to keep them from doing it! Student attitudes have changed. Students have an urgency to share in forming the decisions which affect them. This urgency is accelerating at a pace much too quickly for those presently mandated with decision responsibility to meet.

Faculties no longer concern themselves with academic freedom as a major issue. They pursue a much enlarged role demanding policy and direction formulation for the college in which they have invested their careers.

Individuals and groups want the college to provide new services and new programs--some of which require extended lead time and which cannot readily be implemented due to lack of funds or facilities.

Board of Trustees also want to do more on campus, as well as play an enlarged role in the communities served. They too, have restraints.

Trustees are responsible for establishing policy and direction for the college and for providing the resources needed to meet the educational objectives for which the college is established.

Trustees at tax-supported colleges, like other public boards, work in fishbowls; or more properly, transparent pressure-cookers. Over their shoulders observing every move and every decision, are individuals and groups with varied, and often conflicting, interests. It doesn't take much imagination to wonder why boards deliberate at great length before rendering judgment. Student-power advocates call them the Establishment. Faculty unions call them arch-conservatives. Individuals and groups proposing new programs call them "feet-draggers."

Despite these invidious labels, the limitation of resources, the vexing and sensitive problems in untested environments, boards of these two-year colleges are nonetheless enthusiastic and excited about their mandate and trust. Despite success and progress, they are not fully pleased with their accomplishments and they continue to probe--searching for better and different programs so that more and different people in their "community of concern," can be served. They readily admit that much can be accomplished with more imaginative programs, greater needs can be satisfied, and loftier objectives attained.

Two-year colleges have infinite opportunity for success. They enjoy excellent reputations and have the support of their communities. They receive many worthwhile proposals, some literally thrust upon them with success for each assured. With all this progress, with all the opportunity for greater success, why aren't boards satisfied. What is wrong? What impedes them? What inhibits them?

There are many problems, including campus problems. The latter undermine confidence among the very public from which these colleges seek sustenance and support. Campus problems create and polarize unhealthy adversary relationships. They create a divisiveness, dangerous to any organization which would imperil any effort.

I liken the relationship of the board and the college administration to the management structure of any large business or industry. Both are management: the board establishing policy and the administration carrying it out. By administration, I include the college president, his deans, division and department heads and all others who assist the president in the day-to-day operations of the college.

ADMINISTRATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Effective management diversifies when it must. It makes changes for efficiency and for growth. It reorganizes, amalgamates, and conglomerates when necessary. These changes are purposeful, and business management knows and anticipates the barriers to change and the fears and biases which change creates. It knows that change in attitude is the most difficult to overcome. It directs its efforts to minimize these fears and suspicions by communicating; by instilling confidence in day-to-day accessibility, discussion, and responsiveness; by its willingness to submit or compromise when the facts and issues warrant. In industry, if management is weak, uunresponsive, or isolated, strong union reaction results. If college managment is weak, unresponsive, or isolated, should protest or demonstration be unexpected?

The problems and pressures brought to bear on boards can result from the unavailability and lack of responsiveness of college administrators, some of whom have left the classroom unprepared for the harsh realities of nitty-gritty, day-to-day operating problems. They are unable to cope with the delicate and formidable people problems, of pressures from uninformed professional malcontents, of hierarchies and authorities jealously guarded. Some are ill-equipped to mold divergent and often uncompromising views into wholesome positive programs.

Management ability is often determined solely by academic rank or teaching experience. This in itself may impede; but when placed in a traditional four-year college structure, which is inefficient and ineffective for two-year college program purposes, the results not only impede, but inhibit an alert board.

Two-year colleges are not typical educational institutions. They are not traditionalists in education. Their imaginative programs and innovations are a phenomena of education. As a result, they need a custom-made structure--one suitable for their purpose, and a staff competent to meet the myriad and unprecedented problems, which as new institutions, they are having and which will continue in the known future.

We have copied the same organization structure of our four-year colleges and have the same internal relationships and authority structure, and sometimes succumb to the same academic snobbery. We should change the structuring of functional and staff units and the existing authority relationships if not appropriate for two-year colleges, and make them more effective for attaining the objectives which the college pursues. A few years ago at a college management seminar for boards of trustees, I listened to problems of boards, and felt that the problems weren't difficult; it was the hierarchy structure, the authority relationships, which would not permit their ready resolution. The structure for a two-year college must be flexible. It cannot be rigid.

I believe the '70's will see a change towards a customized two-year college and its mission. We need less emphasis on academic rank and college degrees in assessing qualifications of college administrators. Job requirements are different--the qualification requirements should measure the abilities to meet job needs. The '70's must bring in more individuals with management abilities and competence. They have the decided advantage of not being inhibited by solely four-year college management. We should begin to develop training programs for two-year college administrators, now

FLEXIBILITY IN FACULTY HIRING

Our own administrators are imprisoned in their own specialties and parochial spheres. Many two-year colleges offer occupational-oriented programs, but they hire and pay faculty for these programs principally on degrees attained and articles published. I don't know how many two-year colleges have faculty members who do not hold high school diplomas. To emphasize this point, I make reference to an outstanding computer specialist and programmer who has not only extensive computer and programming experience, but serves as the training specialist in his industry or businesss for in-service training purposes,,giving courses as well to top management on computer orientation. If this individual were to seek a faculty assignment in a two-year college in a computer science program, I wonder how successful he would be without college training, or without a high school diploma. I can tell you however, that a degree-oriented academician who has taken course work, and has minimal "hands-on" experience or exposure in a practicum, will pass the receptionist in the personnel office and probably be interviewed by the department head. I doubt if the first mentioned applicant would.

I hope that in the '70's, two-year colleges will work more closely with industry to identify technicians and specialists of ability, and if necessary train these specialists how to teach. More emphasis should be given to what industry expects when we teach occupational-oriented programs and not what theorists and those immersed in academia pronounce.

I am aware that faculty is assessed in two-year colleges, as they are in four-year colleges--by the number of degrees, the number of articles published, etc. Surely, if we are to provide the quality education we talk about in occupational-oriented programs, the standards for evaluating faculty should be amended.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH LOCAL HIGH SCHOOLS

Two-year colleges must make greater thrust in the high schools. We need full-time representatives in the larger school districts, who would spend their time with high school guidance counselors and students.

What percentage of students failing to continue with some form of education beyond high school do you believe we could interest and "save" if we had a directed student program in high schools. We attend high school career-day exercises, and invite high school guidance personnel to the college for orientation.

Guidance staffs in most high schools are pitifully undermanned for the total job that has to be done. They cannot, and do not meet the demands on their time for student counseling, guidance, testing, evaluation, and the attendant social and economic problems of students. Can you visualize the effectiveness of an alert member of a two-year college staff on-site in a high school? You may suspect conflict and resentment between high school guidance personnel and a college representative. On the contrary, the role of the college representative could enhance the role of high school guidance personnel, if properly planned and administered.

What follow-up is made of high school drop-outs by guidance personnel? Do they pursue and encourage the high school equivalency testing program? What follow-up is made of the high school graduate who did not go on to college? Is he forever ignored? Who takes responsibility for him? There is great potential in the high school for college representatives. The '70's must have a strengthening of ties of the two-year colleges and the high schools. We need a close working partnership.

Two-year colleges must have a vigorous and comprehensive student development center if they are to be effective. By vigorous, I mean one that actively pursues every possibility of advantage and service for the student. By comprehensive I mean one that provides testing services, evaluation, counseling, guidance, and value analysis. An effective placement service must be provided to include all occupational and career information, with personal employer contacts thoroughly nurtured. Our placement personnel should be able to call on a personal and positive basis, any personnel or placement director of any large employer in the area, in disciplines we serve, and arrange for part-time, summer, or career placement opportunities.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE COMMUNITY

I would like to see a partnership of two-year colleges with four-year colleges in programs such as Upward Bound. There should be an extension of the Upward Bound program in two-year colleges. Pending design of this we should seek an immediate partnership with four-year colleges who participate in the program. What percentage of high-school students in the Upward Bound program do not complete the program? What percentage do not go on to college? How many students in the program drop out of high school? How many of these youngsters realized they could not make it on the four-year scene and dropped out of the program for this reason? Effective high school counseling and guidance in the program described earlier, or in an Upward Bound program, with realistic assessment of student abilities and potential, could result in directing those students best suited for two-year college programs to the two-year campus.

There is a clear role for two-year colleges to work with community and neighborhood groups and take responsibility for training the non-high school graduate, who aimlessly exists in the neighborhood. Who takes responsibility for instruction and training in the high school equivalency program? This appears to be a logical and purposeful program for two-year colleges. The purpose of the Equivalency Certificate training is not the attainment of the Certificate. To a two-year college it is the readiness of a potential student. The high school equivalency program appears to be one for which no one takes responsibility. We must identify and train these individuals, for today they are left to their own, undirected and usually, unsuccessful futures.

Another area of thrust, and I use this term to give emphasis to the vigor our attention must have, is the neighborhood, suburbia, and particularly the inner-city where potential students abound. We must offer our courses and programs in these locales. A two-year college may be within commuting distance of the community it serves; however, many potential students cannot leave their neighborhoods. We must make it easy for these potential students, whether in a disadvantaged inner city neighborhood, or in a spacious lawned suburb, to have opportunity to take college courses or college preparatory courses. This can be accomplished by bringing the college to the neighborhood.

There are many groups working on many projects in neighborhoods. We can add college orientation emphasis to these. We can add a high school equivalency training program. We can offer certificate, technical, or any course for which we are best equipped and qualified to offer. This neighborhood emphasis could have great pay-off. We will find ourselves with not only young men and women in our classes, but the housewife, and others in the neighborhood who can avail themselves of the convenient hours and days these courses can be given.

We do this for business and industry; why not the neighborhood? We are in continuing contact with large employers, urging that they avail themselves of the campus and the opportunities the college offers. If an employer wants a group of its employees to take a course, whether occupational, in the humanities or social sciences, we will actively oblige. If he wishes to supply all the students and have the course or program conducted at his premises, we will send the instructor to the employer's site. Why can't we go to the neighborhood and hold classes in a storefront? I think the '70's will accelerate college-neighborhood programs.

We are not going to compete with high schools offering adult education programs. We are going to offer college-level or college-related courses and programs.

We should employ high school and, where necessary, neighborhood representatives. Possibly there is a neighborhood action committee that can serve as liaison with a high school/college representative. I'm not advocating a job for each module of interest or discipline. What I am advocating is attention to the great possibilities that slip by each day and the number of students we fail to win, because no one has the direct responsibility for identifying them and latching on to them.

Every neighborhood has many knowledgeable people who know the youngsters, their needs, their interests and the approaches to be used in this "search and win" program.

If two-year college leadership extends its active efforts in service to neighborhoods, the result will be the great strides in achieving its objectives of "a college education for all."

RELATIONSHIPS WITH INDUSTRY

We need a much stronger partnership with industry. We need greater participation in full-time cooperative education programs for students and faculty during summer months, and part-time programs throughout the year. This will insure that the student knows what industry expects of him; it will let the faculty know what the student needs and what employers want; it will let industry know what to expect from the college and the students. It has the advantage of motivating employer personnel, that possibly they, too, need refresher education or training, and that it is important they avail themselves of opportunities at the college.

The college should encourage our department heads, staff, and instructors in each occupational program to develop direct and close relationships with employers. We must have our faculty and industry and business work in partnership during the year, and full-time during the summer. Technology training for our faculty gives them the needed "hands-on" experience in the latest techniques, and permits updating their abilities and training skills. When our faculty is aware of the latest techniques and equipment used in industry, more effective instruction at the college is possible which benefits both the student and the potential employer. The faculty-industry partnership can also open new coursesof instruction.

We must loan our experts, faculty, or staff, when needed for assistance and resolution of a local problem. Boards must establish liberal policies on this, especially where the public sector is in need of college expertise, and facilities such as laboratories, etc.

We should become an active part in every worthwhile civic program because we are part of the community. We need more dialogue with communities and community organizations. The welfare problem of a city is not just the city's problem. It is the college's problem as well. It is part of our involvement with the individuals working in community action or neighborhood groups. We do not want organizations or their representatives to feel they must come to the college--we should seek out the organizations and let them know who we are and what we can do, and then deliver when asked. Those who need our organization the most are often the ones who can't use it; who can't avail themselves of it, because of their isolation, inconvenience, etc. We must take the initiative because of our responsibility to every organization and every person in our community.

Two-year colleges, some of them so new that they have not had a class graduate, or an alumni association formed, should assist their alumni in every way possible in forming as association and support their graduates who should serve as a vital motivating force for the college.

Two-year colleges can work closely with rehabilitation clinics, workshops and shelter, and assist in training or re-training individuals both on and off campus. The two-year colleges should undertake tutorial courses, as necessary.

To indicate the extent to which course opportunities are possible, we have arranged for courses in the humanities and social sciences to be taught at a county prison. The guards at this prison have now indicated interest in courses we offer.

We have a certificate program for teacher aides. I need not relate how great the need is for teacher aides. I find that this is a subject which teacher unions have placed in contracts being negotiated with public boards of education.

We have a one-year certificate program entitled "Job Horizons." This program offers mature women an opportunity to enter the labor market in clerical and secretarial work. Mature women require and receive special counseling. When children are raised and the mother wants to enter the job market, or re-enter it, training is needed. The electric typewriter, modern transcription devices, telephone call-directors--these frighten the former typist or clerical worker. The Job Horizons program answers the questions: What job can I learn; Where do I begin; Where should I work? Thus far, each of our Job Horizon graduates have been given a choice of three jobs.

Our computer on campus is used for back-up support for county and municipal governments. This has resulted in great interest on the part of public officials in the county in the services of the college and its courses. We are now arranging for workshops in contract administration for local governments. We provide space and facilities for Polic Academy lectures.

We have a GOAL Program (Go On And Learn) for those who cannot afford to attend college but who wish to attend. This is a state-supported program and includes payment not only for tuition and books--but also meals and transportation.

We have taken the educationally disadvantaged and have a very successful one-year, non-credit pre-technical (pre-college) program for those who do not indicate they can do college level work, but have a high interest in attending college.

We try talent search programs where members of the college staff go into high schools and "seek out" those students who do not want to go to college or who indicate little interest in college. Some students feel that further school work will not help them in the job market. This is a valuable but limited effort to the total "seek-out" program I would like to see.

We are now establishing a journalism course as a cooperative venture with a local newspaper, with college facilities used and college faculty instructing. Great emphasis is placed on-the-job at the newspaper, where students work with reporters on assignments, and on other newspaper functions.

It is difficult to convince anyone of the sincerity of another. Yet, in dwelling on off-campus interest to which I give emphasis here, and to pursue new programs, new enviornments, and new "publics," while at the same time meeting on-campus demands of students and faculty, the board of trustees faces a difficult and disquieting anomaly. Students have needs and make demands. They want a larger role in the operation of the college and in establishing its policy and direction. I believe that they should do more, and that two-year colleges will find areas and means in which students will participate in those decisions which affect them. The faculty, in addition to its demands for salary and fringe benefits, seeks status and authority beyond the class room, for it too feels it should contribute to the direction and operation of the college. I believe faculties must be involved and serve in such capacities in the immediate periods ahead, for they provide a tremendous resource. It is the Board of Trustees however, which must keep the total scene in balance. Imbalance is dangerous.

It appears that colleges generally enjoy too few situations today where faculty, students, and the administration work harmoniously and effectively. I would like to think of these three groups as a troika, each pulling in the direction which it sees, but at least pulling in the same direction.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DR. COLLINS: I'd like to ask a question first and then to present very briefly a kind of a model that I recently developed in an a article on boards of trustees and see what your reaction may be. The question is this: In California, boards of trustees are elected. I gathered from your comments that you're appointed. By whom are you appointed and what is the criteria for appointment?

MR. KLEGMAN: We're appointed by our county supervisors or we call them boards of freedholders who run county services, county government.

The chairman of the board is the retired fromer president of one of the Johnson & Johnson subsidiaries. He was selected first. He then sat down with the county supervisors to discuss pulling people from various areas of the county. We have a retired superintendent of schools, a housewife, a union leader, a lawyer, and an accountant. I came from the public sector.

DR. COLLINS: Let me outline this idea and see what you and others might think of it. Part of it was initiated by reading a study published by the Educational Testing Service on boards of trustees. The ETS pretty well demonstrated that the composition of Boards of Trustees at institutions of higher learning, whether at universities, state colleges, or junior colleges, generally is not very representative of the people involved. For example, in community colleges, the average trustee salary or average income was something in the neighborhood of $15,000 which is way in excess of the average income of the parents of the community college students. Only two percent of the members of boards of trustees had ever attended a junior college themselves. Ninety percent of them were in that upper classification of the usual occupational scales--managerial, professional and business.

The question that I was curious about is what if you have a board of trustees that was based upon proportional representation and that the proportional representation could be tied to input. Ordinarily, we think of boards of trustees as sort of the people who can call the tune because they pay the piper or at least they represent that. They're the spokesmen for the taxpayer but there's a lot of input other than taxes in a community college. There's the input of administration and all of the strength and creativity and so on that they provide. Then there is the massive input of the faculty, the input of the students--past, present, old, young, day, evening--and you had indicated in your remarks that rather special group of people who have a remarkable involvement with the community colleges, the alumni.

What if you had a seven-man board, three of them elected or appointed at large and representing basically what present boards represent currently whether that be money or the highest level of citizenship. Then add the president or the executive officer of the college. He would give the sort of wide angle lens view of the college and its administration. Another member of the board would be the Faculty Senate president or the ex-Faculty Senate president. As you probably know, a year in that position and you practically are assistant president; you know the ropes.

The sixth member would be a sophomore student who had been a conscientious board watcher during his freshman year, and would be elected by the students. The seventh member would be elected by the alumni of the college as well as those who are in the evening division. The idea of all of this would be to make the board representative on the basis of actual involvement, actual contribution to the on-going life of that college.

I didn't mean to make a speech but I wanted to know what your reaction would be.

MR. KLEGMAN: I would say that this proposal appears sound. However, will it work? This takes the board of higher education to accede. If legislation is made for the board to have these members, what are the dangers? Do we draw lines?

So I would say any group aware of its responsibilities and its mandate and its trust will be successful. I think that there will be many experiments. I think we'll find students on boards, faculty on boards but, as I say, they'll fulfill their role or destroy the institution.

You know, our faculty doesn't want new programs. Many of them say, "Let's manage with what we have." "We don't do well with what we're doing now." Our students don't want more programs, they don't want occupational programs, just liberal arts once they get on campus.

The faculty, yes, it has a greater stake, let's say. It's going to be there. They also have a greater stake economically. However, faculty are equally conservative, not interested in new programs or in too much change.

DR. WOLFBEIN: This is a very interesting comment. It also applies to groups other than trustees. At our university we questioned why should trustees and faculty and professors and all the rest of the big wheels do the disciplining. Let the elected representatives of the student board do it. Somebody suggested this for even the black students. They felt they were getting the short end of the disciplinary action so we elected a disciplinary board, elected from other student groups and they were the ones who chose the disciplinary measure. This board was much harder on the students than the faculty ever was. They were giving all sorts of fines, kicking students out of school, and we finally had to turn the damn thing around and stop it.

I'm always worried about tacklinga substitute program through reorganization of the structure. We just went through something like this in Washington. Commissioner Allen is very big on saying that we have to have a separate Department of Education. The argument being that education gets lost in Health and Welfare. As you know, some Congressmen are agreeing with him and are putting in bills for a new Department of Education and Training of Manpower. When you push these people, you find that they're very hopeful that a restructuring such as a new cabinet department might be at least partially an answer to the substantive problems that are involved in the field of education and training. I get a little worried and I wonder whether that's really the answer to the substantive problems that we have in education.

DR. ESKOW: You know, it occurs to me that when trustees represented a religious denomination that was running an institution, they had a function, a very clear function, that was sheer indoctrination. When they represent a private institution and they see as their primary responsibility the care and raising of funds and property to make the institution possible, they have a clear function.

I secretly wonder what their function is in a public institution, in a public community college. What would happen in most of our community colleges if, for some reason of illness or something or other, the board couldn't meet for six months or a year? Would anything really really happen?

MR. KLEGMAN: You know, frankly, nothing would happen. True, there are certain things that only the board can do; the budget, the approval of architectural plans, the appointment of teachers. If the administration is effective, it operates the school within the policies agreed upon by the board.

DR. ESKOW: I think part of the point that I'm considering which you raised and perhaps I can raise again this way is: you are a manager, an administrator of a very complex organization. You make decisions and are responsible for a variety of operations. Now, if you had to report every month to a group of nine lay people who knew really very little about the substance and problems of your organization and if at that meeting every category of employee whom you oversee was able to appear and complain in that kind of arena, I wonder if you might feel that the process emasculates your administrative ability. I'm also wondering now if part of the weakness and ambiguity and indecisiveness of administration that we are seeing regularly is accounted for by the fact that our institutions are now in a confrontational context. We have the adversary relationships, the problems, the violence, the very important social problems, and yet, the people who are suppose to be managing these institutions find themselves or feel themselves increasingly responsible to laymen who can question their decisions, reverse them and so on. In other words, maybe there's something structural here that has to be examined.

MR. KLEGMAN: I don't find this, at least on our campus. Frankly, the board does more reaffirmation of the president's actions. In fact, very little disapproval, and certainly it is never publicly. This is just a matter of we wash our own dirty linen in our own home, not before the public or the press.

But to undermine the president is inexcusable if you have appointed one and you have contact on campus as we do, because we're there weekly in one meeting or another. We know his job is not an easy one. I think our role is to support the individual we have faith in and who is doing a good job. We're fortunate because we have a very competent and a strong president, but what you say is true.

DR. HARTLEY: I'd like to take Steve's proposal and turn it around in the other direction. Supposing we turned the thing around the other way and rather than eliminating trustees, see what would happen if we tried paying trustees $5,000 a year or whatever--you pick it--for whatever amount of time they spend or whatever we think is important here for them to do some kind of job, whatever it is they can do best. I wonder where this would lead us.

The average trustee spends maybe one or two hours a week at his activities. I wonder what would happen if he were paid to spend ten or twenty hours a week, instead of doing it in a voluntary sense as I suspect you do. Could this bring anything new to a college community? What you're looking at the other representative elements in a college community, certainly the faculty are becoming more and more important and we're seeking their consensus about the institution. In many cases also the students are now participating in this.

DR. FARRIS: I'm concerned about this suggestion about putting a student on the board, for one simple reason. I find this usually results in tokenism with which I'm very familiar and also I don't think one student at this time can possibly represent all the students' and factions' views. I recommend that you have a subcommittee of students and that they elect their own representative who goes to the board.

This is almost a full-time job and I think it's unfair to a student to ask him to put in that kind of time when he is there to seek an education. The subcommittee could serve as a group of persons who could share the work.

DR. COLLINS: I think the ETS study proved you to be exactly right, it's upper class WASPS.

MR. PATTERSON: Why do you think that they do want to confront the establishment rather than working through their committee structure? From my previous experiences, too often these group of people are not communicating with each other. I have never seen the minutes of the trustee's meeting and only attended the meeting as part of administration. I know the faculty asked many times what happend at the trustees' meetings. The students hardly know it exists. Likewise student councils are out of touch with the trustees in terms of communication. What's wrong with our so-called establishment if we're not talking to each other? Maybe this is part of the problem. We just don't understand each other's role because we're not communicating among the agencies of the establishment. Like the guidance counselors, for instance, who are not in touch with the dropouts because their boards of education said, you will deal with four-year colleges first, two-year colleges second, dropouts last. Maybe you should go to the board and say to them, "What are you going to do about the dropouts?" Because there's just no communication. If someone can solve this problem of communicating as we sit here and talk about it, go out and again communicate with these various facets of the organization. Maybe that will do something or something will happen.

MR. KLEGMAN: This is why I talked about organization. An organization isn't just structuring people and relationships, it's a communications structure.

DR. MEDER: You mentioned a few moments ago the firm, strong administrator Could you tell me, please, what kind of behaviour do you think a strong administrator exhibits?

MR. KLEGMAN: He has the courage to be accessible; to meet with students, to attend student senate meetings, to stand and hear and be confronted, and to respond and when appropriate to look into the question and to make a change; to demand and to have high standards; to compromise where the issue warrants compromise. He must be an intelligent and flexible individual.

DR. ESKOW: I continue to wonder how we isolate the function of the board of trustees in the 1970's. I think before we determine whether or not there ought to be a faculty members on it, or students on it, we have to know what it does. At this moment in time I really don't clearly understand what we think the principal business of a board of trustees is.

MR. KLEGMAN: Ours is outlined in law. We have some sixteen or seventeen items in the law which says this is what boards of trustees will do. They will appoint. That means every appointment is made by the board, and they are the removing officers, too. They present the budget, work with the county supervisors in determining the type of budget that we can expect, they are responsible for providing facilities, providng the building, hiring the architect, and so on. These are the things that we're mandated to do.

DR. COLLINS: I'm enough of a Democrat to be vastly concerned about the whole issue of whether there should or shouldn't be boards, because it seems, at least as I would read it, that if you did not have the board, then the president would hold all power. It seems quite evident to me that the function of the board is that of a legislative body. It is the legally constituted group of citizens that are supposed to represent the general citizenry and, therefore, give total direction to the college. I think that it would be a disastrous move really to move away from the concept of a trustees board. I would ask President Eskow this question: if he did not have a board, who do you think would be the constituency to whom the president is responsible? Who is the president's constituency then, the students, the faculty or how would he--how would he or could he make the whole community his constituency?

DR. ESKOW: I have a problem here. I think the boards of trustees are terribly important. They're move viable now than they ever were. I think that what I'm trying to suggest is that there is complete confusion as to the role or the mission of the board of trustees. I think the president has to have a board of trustees as a legislative body and as a buffer between the institution and the broad public out there. People who want to place people in jobs, and it's that kind of thing that makes me question whether or not most boards of trustees have signaled clearly to the internal constituencies and to the larger public exactly what their role is.

For example, let me make an affirmative statement. Any board of trustees that doesn't let the public know that it will never place a person from maintenance man to a dean in that institution, that it will never exercise influence, I think is derelict and is confusing the public; and any board that does not let the faculty know that it will never interfere with grades is making a mistake. In other words, I think, we have to strip away certain areas of ambiguity before we can begin to talk about what a board really can do for an institution. This is the whole point I've been trying to make.

IV. SUMMARY

CONFERENCE OBSERVATIONS

Joan Purtell

Miss Purtell received her Bachelors Degree from State University of New York at Binghamton, her Master's from Syracuse University and is currently a candidate for the Ed.d. at State University of New York at Albany. Before accepting her present position as Administrative Assistant for the Office of Two-Year Colleges, Miss Purtell served as Associate Dean of Students at Broome Community College in Binghamton and as Director of Admissions at Middlesex County College, New Jersey.

Graduate students always appreciate an opportunity to listen to and exchange ideas with educational leaders from many areas and with a variety of special interests. In this respect this program offered a unique opportunity to gain a many sided perspective of the problems and challenges facing community colleges through the next decade. While not attempting to encapsulate the entire program, certain topics appear worth noting to illustrate some of the areas of concern which have implications to our plans and actions in community colleges.

Several participants addressed themselves to the inappropriateness or lack of preparation of college administrators for rapidly developing and complex institutions of today. Many presidents appear unprepared by training, talent, and temperament for the kinds of forces with which they are confronted. It was also noted that graduate schools are perpetuating irrelevant or obsolete situations. One solution proposed was to encourage in-service community college campus training programs whereby a local campus would hire a new college graduate and then provide a master teacher who could provide a relevant program of teacher preparation on the campus.

Educators were urged to get off the academic gold standard and look for human understanding. It was contended that our present testing programs measure what is measurable rather than that which is significant. If we are going to begin educating the average and disadvantaged students, we must begin to devote considerable attention to the results of teaching--particularly the process itself. Those teachers who teach subjects without regard to the individual and his understanding or interpretation of the subject matter cannot claim to be teachers.

Those involved in placement of students remind us there is a difference between years of school attendance and educational attainment. It was clear that job descriptions and functions change with the availability of personnel. This raises a question of validity in regard to curriculum standards or requirements. If occupations themselves are constantly changing, then rigid standards for academic programs can be questionned.

Do the poor subsidize the education of the rich? Our financial experts provided evidence that this is not the case. It can be demonstrated that investments in education are not only beneficial to society as a whole but that investments in individuals are returned to the public coffer many times over by way of increased ability to support themselves and make financial returns through purchasing power and payment of taxes.

The era of collective negotiations is now with us. Once our laws create the possibility for this in our colleges, all segments of the college population will become involved in areas of concern to them. It may be ex expected that students as well as administrators, professional staff and faculty will represent their interests some way or at some point in the negotiation arena. Evidence also indicates that without specific limitations of a law, all actions and policies of an educational institution are potentially within the bargaining process. It is then, imperative for campus governing bodies to examine their practices and philosophies within an educational context prior to times of crisis or conflict if the educational missions of institutions are to be coherent and survive.

The trustees review various models of institutions and observe inadequacies both in organization and availability of adequately prepared administrators. There should be new models for community colleges to serve new needs that mimic neither the traditional four-year colleges and universities, nor business and industry. Perhaps professional training for administrators would be more valuable than academic credentials. In spite of some popular criticism, the trustees appear to serve a very valid function. They serve as representatives of various segments of the public and continued efforts should be made to assure that trustees represent all segments. However, the question of including students who have immediate vested interests as members of the trustees is seriously questionned.

It was not the purpose of the conference to provide answers, only to raise issues. However, some concrete results were evidenced as we witnessed cooperative actions being planned between the centers in California and SUNY. Individuals planned continued correspondence on topics of mutual interest and concern. The idea of similar conferences in other states were explored and graduate students returned to class or to positions with a new appreciation of the complexity of the challenges and the enthusiasm of the many people who will meet these challenges.

APPENDIX:

PARTICIPANTS

Aldington, Thomas - Associate Professor (Mechanical Technology)
Mohawk Valley Community College

Als, David - Research Associate (Office of Special Programs)
Office of University-Wide Activities, SUNY

Birklund, Carl H. - Assistant Professor (Guidance and Personnel Services)
SUNY-Albany

Brewer, Floyd I. - Associate Professor (Guidance and Personnel Services)
SUNY-Albany

Bristow, Ronald - Associate University Dean of Student Affairs
(University-Wide Activities) SUNY

Bulger, Paul G. - Professor of Education (Educational Administration)
SUNY-Albany

Carr, Edward - Director, Division of Higher Education, State
Education Department

Chakonas, Paul - Bureau of Two-Year Colleges, State Education Department

Chambers, Merritt M. - Consultant; Professor of Educational Administration
Illinois State University; Special Contributor on
Chronicle of Higher Education

Collins, Charles C. - Consultant; Associate Director, Junior College
Leadership Program, University of California
at Berkeley

Dillon, Harold J. - Professor of Education (Educational Administration)
SUNY-Albany

Doran, Kenneth - Associate University Dean of Two-Year Colleges, SUNY

Eskow, Seymour - Consultant; President, Rockland Community College

Farris, Vera K. - Consultant; Assistant to Academic Vice President,
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Feister, William - Assistant Professor (Guidance and Personnel Services)
SUNY-Albany

Fraser, Robert M. - Assistant University Dean of Two-Year Colleges, SUNY

Gardner, Randolph S. - Dean, School of Education, SUNY-Albany

Gragg, William L. - President, Fulton-Montgomery Community College

Gray, Lawrence - Chief, Bureau of Two-Year College Programs, State
Education Department

Hanson, Lincoln - Representative of Faculty Council of Two-Year Colleges; Professor, Psychology, Rockland Community College

Hartley, David - Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) SUNY-Albany

Hitchcock, Arthur A. - Professor of Education and Chairman of Guidance and Personnel Services, SUNY-Albany

Holmes, H. Frederick - Assistant University Dean of Two-Year Colleges, SUNY

Howes, Harold R. - Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) and Director of Veterans Counseling Center, SUNY-Albany

Kenney, Ralph B. - Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) SUNY-Albany

Klegman, Joseph - Consultant; Director of Postal Data Center; Trustee, Middlesex County College

Kuusisto, Allan A. - Acting President, SUNY-Albany

Martorana, Sebastian V. - Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges, SUNY

McHugh, William F. - Consultant; Special Counsel for Employment Relations SUNY

Neder, Charles J. - Representative of Academic Deans of Two-Year Colleges Dean, Community College of the Finger Lakes

Norton, Joseph L. - Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) SUNY-Albany

Patterson, Stanley- Assistant for Two-Year College Programs, SUNY

Purtell, Joan - Intern, Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Two-Year Colleges, SUNY

Reavis, John - Coordinator of Special Programs, Office of University-Wide Activities, SUNY

Reeves, J. Maxson - Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) SUNY-Albany

Reynolds, Michael - Assistant Vice Chancellor for Evaluation and Accreditation, SUNY

Robbins, William A. - Director, Two-Year College Student Development Center, SUNY-Albany

Skorpen, Harold - Associate in Higher Education, State Education Department

Terrero, William - Assistant Coordinator, Office of Special Programs, Office of University-Wide Activities, SUNY

Tibbetts, J. Ralph- Professor of Education (Guidance and Personnel Services) and Chairman of Teacher Education Program, SUNY-Albany

Wolfbein, Seymour L. - Consultant; Dean, School of Business Administration, Temple University